

AIYANGAR COLLECTION

# INDIA'S PLACE IN POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

BY

K. T. SHAH



PUBLISHERS

PADMA PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

BOMBAY



Current Topics Series, No. 9

India's Place in Post-War Reconstruction.

First Published, March, 1943.

712  
SH/3

*Copyright Reserved*

Printed by V. R. Savant at the Associated Advertisers & Printers Ltd.  
505, Arthur Road, Tardeo, Bombay 7, and published by I. D. Kotwal for  
Padma Publications Ltd., 53-55, Laxmi Building, Sir Pherozshah Mehta Road,  
Bombay.

**TO**

**J. N.**

**Kennst Du Das Wohl**

## CONTENTS

---

PREFACE	.. .. .	1
I. INTRODUCTORY	.. .. .	3
II. BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION	.. .. .	21
III. WORLD REORGANISATION	.. .. .	40
IV. PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION	.. .. .	52
V. THE WORLD REORGANISED	.. .. .	73
VI. INDIA UNDER RECONSTRUCTION	.. .. .	87





## PREFACE

The following pages represent the substance of a lecture, delivered on July 12, 1942, in Gujarati, under the auspices of the Gujarat Vernacular Society, and published in their magazine, *Buddhi Prakash*, of December 1942.

As the matter appears now, it is not a mere translation of what was said in the lecture. It was considerably expanded even in Gujarati; and has been re-arranged, and brought up to date for the present purpose.

Some parts of this lecture have also appeared in the form of articles in the *Bombay Chronicle*, with special reference to the scheme of world reconstruction adumbrated in the Atlantic Charter. They have been reproduced substantially in these pages, as they bear reference, more particularly to the world at large than to India only.

The place of India, however, in the reconstructed world has been indicated in some detail wherever, pursuing the main argument of the lecture, it appeared proper and relevant.

The initial idea of this work, and the basic principles accepted herein, were considered in collaboration with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru early last year, while he was at liberty. It was then proposed to express these views in the form of articles to the *National Herald* and some other papers. Circumstances, however, made it impossible for the original plan to be carried out. Several months had passed by when the lecture in Gujarati was delivered. But the matter is still engaging public attention in this as in all countries. And so the writer thinks it a suitable moment to place his own views before the public, needless to say, entirely on his own responsibility.

## PREFACE

The substance being a lecture, it has not been possible to split up the matter into specific chapters or sections in the work, as it now appears in print. Convenient sectional headings have, however, been added to facilitate a closer study.

Bombay

March 4, 1943.

K. T. SHAH.

# INDIA'S PLACE

## IN

### POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

#### I

#### INTRODUCTORY

#### THE WAR—A WORLD STRUGGLE

The War has now spread throughout the world. There is not a single important country which is not, directly or indirectly, involved in it. In countries which are themselves actively engaged in the war, there has been effected a silent revolution on a very large, but unnoticed, scale. In order to fight, to produce the armaments necessary for fighting, to supply the food and material for the fighting population, to protect the civil population, to give it work under proper organisation, and help to maintain a certain standard of living for them, every people engaged directly in the war find their administration, their social organisation, their collective life, steadily but silently, radically but invisibly, altered.

#### EFFECTING SILENT REVOLUTION IN PRODUCTION

It is unnecessary to give a detailed description of this silent revolution. We all have seen,—and a good many of us have experienced,—how, simply because of the war, the productive organisation in every country has been revolutionised. Every factor of production has undergone a tremendous change. The primary productive agents, like land or factories, are now impossible to ope-

rate according to the sweet will of the owners. It is the Government which lays down the policy, as well as specific programme of operating these means of production.

The prices of all products are, at the same time, controlled, regulated, and determined by the same central agency. This determination is not in accordance with the relative value of the products, or their cost of production, but in accordance with the requirements of the efficient conduct of the war. Cost of production has little or no significance. Purchasing power, too, is shorn of much of its effectiveness in demand—at least in countries which take forethought in these matters. Supply must at any cost equal the demand, if it relates to the essentials of fighting; and demand must adjust itself to supply.

Even where Government do not themselves determine the price of any commodity, they put definite restrictions upon its free exchange, and regulate or control both its production and exchange. The regime extends to all raw materials of industry, to finished goods for consumption, to transport and communication, to social services and public utilities.

### THE RIGHTS OF PROPRIETORSHIP

The principle of private property may, *qua* principle, be, even now, accepted as a basis in several of these countries. But many an ancient and unquestioned right of property is daily disappearing, or undermined at least. Proprietorship, therefore, has become only a name, an abstraction, with neither body nor bones, neither soul nor substance.

### THE RIGHTS OF LABOUR

Along with this transformation in the rights of property, the labour of men has also come under the same system of rigid control and close regulation. Gone are the glories of lightning strikes, and dead the days of autocratic lockouts. All must be workers—masters as well as men—in

## INTRODUCTORY

the common vineyard. There is, in fact, more control over labour than over capital. Only, Labour being more accustomed to it, makes less fuss. Having more at stake in the outcome of the struggle, it raises less objection to any restriction, needed to make the struggle final and decisive.

In the belligerent countries there is not even a nominal freedom to the individual to take his labour where he can get the best value for it. Freedom of bargaining is a thing of the past. Almost everywhere there is conscription, social as well as military. Men between 20 and 40 or 50 have to join the armed forces, be trained for active warfare, and live a life of constant readiness to die, with joy forgotten, happiness disappeared, death on the horizon, and discipline all round them. Those conscripted for active service, —men, women and even children,—have to do work behind the lines, in the field or factory, producing food and armaments. Fire-watchers, civic guards, medical and nursing attendants, have each their allotted task in the war-ridden world. A complete mobilisation of manpower is inevitable for every country engaged in this totalitarian war. How then can there be any personal freedom for the individual citizen? Needless to add, the return for this labour is not fixed by competitive conditions of demand and supply. The only decisive factor is the ability of the community commandeering such services.

## CONTROL OF CONSUMPTION

With goods and services thus conscripted for purposes of war, the entire system of consumption inevitably followed suit. On every article of consumption, there is some restriction, if not rigid rationing; some control and supervision, if not direct production and distribution by the State. Rationing or restrictions are not only to equalise available supplies to all consumers. It is aimed, also, at reducing consumption, to guard against price control proving ineffective, or *flat* money multiplying in an unrestricted brood of inflation. At the same time, hoarding is for-

bidden. Every citizen must thus make an equal sacrifice with his neighbour, suffer the same privations, shoulder the same burdens.

International commerce, too, has ceased to exist all over the world,—except, perhaps, as a mere ghost of what it was. The entire mechanism of local as well as international trade is now in Government hands, or under Government control. What goods should be imported or exported, from what country, in what quantities, by what route or vehicle,—are all matters of Government regulation. Without permit, no supply can be had; without priority certificate, no freight or Foreign Exchange. Even ordinary insurance, not to speak of war risks, has come under Government control, if not become a public enterprise.

### REVOLUTION BY TAXATION

All this is abundant evidence of the silent revolution already effected. But more is yet to come. The volume and variety, the pressure and incidence, of taxation in belligerent countries have soared to such heights, that the entire social system undergoes an imperceptible change by the effects of such taxation. The rates of income-tax and super-tax have been considerably stepped up and the graduation stiffened. All forms of property are liable to a variety of taxation; while business or individual enterprise must submit to what is called the Excess Profits Tax. Excise duties on local produce, permit fees on acts of exchange, customs dues on imports and exports, higher rates of transport and communication,—all add to the burden. Necessarily, therefore, private, individual wealth is shrinking daily; and the day seems not far off, when, if this process continues, it would disappear altogether.

I will not weep when that day dawns. I will only add that, as if all this is not enough, in several countries, means, besides rationing, have been devised to compel savings and invest them in war loans, defence bonds, savings cer-

## INTRODUCTORY

tificates,—all intended to curtail consumption, or to prevent inflation.

If any proportion of private wealth or income remains, after this ubiquitous taxation has taken its toll, or compulsory war loans swelled the war chest, it is still not permissible to utilise it for one's own enjoyment, at one's own discretion. Few of the pre-war means of enjoyment are now available. If any do survive, their use is often prohibited. Supplies of food and drink and clothing are scarce; and what is available is strictly rationed. Travel is forbidden, except as an unavoidable necessity; entertainment is impossible; recreation scarce.

## REACTION ON MONEY

With such a revolution going on, the form and function of money, today the basis of all values, must necessarily change. Even before the war, the precious metals had begun to disappear from the ordinary circulation. The ideal of stability in the value of the money material had long been scrapped as obsolete and uneconomical. Money was recognised to be more and more a mere means to effect exchanges, whose value in terms of other commodities can be determined by governmental fiat. The war has very much widened its application. And so everywhere today money is but pieces of paper, a Government monopoly issued by a central organisation appointed for the purpose. Its price is determined in effect by the command of the sovereign; and its future is dependent upon the stability of that authority.

If we leave aside the exceptional position of a country like the United States of America, or the U.S.S.R., there is hardly anywhere any substantial backing behind the paper currency, now circulating in every country. The only reserve is the productive ability of the community concerned, and the credit of their issuing authority. Gold and silver, as part of the currency reserves, have either disappeared, or shrunk to very slender proportions. What



still remains of them is certainly not available for converting currency notes into precious metals, as and when any holder of such notes wants to do so. The might of money is ended; the reign of gold is over; the sovereignty of the precious metals is dead. Credit, not of the individual, but of the community collectively;—faith, not in the actual, but in the potential wealth and resources of a people,—is taking its place.

### **SIMILAR REVOLUTION IN NON-BELLIGERENTS**

This faint outline of the revolution, now working itself out, relates to the countries engaged directly in the war. Others, which are not yet actively engaged, are in no materially different position. The war goes on over such a vast area, and so many of the leading nations are intimately involved in it, that the changing conditions in them cannot but affect their neighbours, or customers, which have so far remained out of actual hostilities.

The reason for this reaction upon such countries is not difficult to see. These countries have close affinity and constant relations with countries directly concerned in the war, on one or the other side. International relations arise, in general, from commerce; and commerce has, if not disappeared, come almost entirely under the control and direction of the State, not only in countries actually engaged in hostilities, but also in their customers, creditors or sympathisers. The accessories of commerce, too,—Shipping, Banking, Exchange, Insurance,—must follow suit. And so, through all these, an invisible revolution silently occurs even in countries themselves not belligerents.

Besides, even if any country is itself aloof from the war, no one can say today with certainty as to when it may or will have to be involved. This war is, in the ultimate analysis, a conflict of ideals. And since every country has its own ideals of Government and social organisation, it goes without saying that these neutral

## INTRODUCTORY

countries, too, may have their partiality for ideals of Government and social organisation, accepted by one or the other side in this war. It is difficult to say when this divergence of idealism will force them into active fighting; but that they may be on the brink, and must be ready to face the eventuality, is only a matter of sagacity in statesmanship.

In the name of their own self-defence, therefore, these apparently neutral countries go on accumulating armaments, disciplining their manpower, and providing for safeguarding themselves. Even in these countries, consequently, the entire field of production and distribution, commerce and consumption, taxation and currency, have all to submit to close regulation, control and supervision by the State.

## AND IN NEUTRALS

If we exclude the countries which are either directly engaged in warfare, and those seemingly neutral, but with invisible, yet indubitable, partiality for the one or the other side, who remain? There is hardly a nation today which does not have the slightest contact of any kind with the warring nations, directly or indirectly. In Asia,—Nepal and Afghanistan; in Europe,—Spain and Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and Turkey, might be described as neutrals. And even they are not altogether without some leaning for the one or the other side. The war is in their neighbourhood, hostilities are at their gate. Their production and consumption; their commerce and communications, are deeply tinged by the exigencies of warfare. How can even these countries be completely free from any reaction of the war?

This silent revolution is deep, its progress rapid, its extent universal. As it is, however, being effected without violence, commonly associated with revolutions, those who only see on the surface, do not realise its depth and durability. But whether you call it a mere change, or a

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

fundamental revolution, it is nowhere being conducted in accordance with a pre-determined, carefully thought out, plan. Its nature and operation, its consequences and extent, are left to chance, like an autumn leaf blowing where the wind listeth. If we exclude Russia, or perhaps Germany, these changes are everywhere accidental, without as yet any relation to, or integration with, the normal, peacetime life of the communities concerned. It is like an unexpected flood, with movement invisible, progress incalculable, unpredictable, perhaps unwelcome because it is undesirable.

### POSITION IN INDIA

So far, not even the name of India has been mentioned. India is one of the leading countries of the world, with one-fifth of the world's population, and a fair proportion of the world's wealth,—at least potentially. The moment Britain declared war, the Government of India, a dutiful subordinate, entered on its own account as well, without a reference to her people, or counsel with their leaders. They have declared their active sympathy to be on the side of freedom and democracy; but the people of India have been clamouring for their national emancipation for generations. She has been forced into the struggle, which is none of her seeking; and is made to suffer for no very likely benefit to herself. Whatever her people's sympathies, she is but a passive tool of Imperial Britain.

There are obvious reasons why India has not yet conscripted the entire population for warlike purposes. But every month, recruiting for the different branches of armed forces has been averaging 70,000 a month. In the first two years, hostilities could not perhaps be said to have come to India's doorstep. And even today warfare is not actually on her own territory. Nevertheless, her production and consumption, her commerce and communication, taxation and prices, have come under wartime governmental control. New industries are said to have been

## INTRODUCTORY

started, and old ones expanded far beyond the rosier expectations of pre-war days. New trends have been given to our commerce; new mechanism forged for regulation, and control, which have brought an enormous accession of power and authority to an already over-powerful bureaucracy, all the more dangerous because constitutional government has been suspended in many provinces. The Defence of India Act is a most fecund invention for foaling out an innumerable progeny of rules to control or prevent not only the political activities of popular leaders, but also regulate the production and distribution of all kinds of goods and services. The innumerable activities and experiments of newly established vested interests, are pregnant with their own menace to the economic advancement of India on sane lines when the war is ended. All these give ground enough for us to be profoundly interested in the post-war world reconstruction.

### PLANNED CHANGE—AND UNPLANNED

In countries where the profound changes brought by war have been thought out in advance, and directed according to some pre-determined plan, it follows certain definite channels, remains within proper control, and accomplishes pre-concerted aims. But in countries where personal freedom has been confounded with anarchy, and unco-ordinated individual effort with initiative and enterprise, unorganised exuberance with the means of training up self-reliance, the ground forces of these revolutionary changes are left to work their will without bridle or bit. In such communities no one can say where and how the tide of change,—unfathomed, uncontrolled, undirected,—will turn, and how it will act, whether for the benefit or for the disaster of the community concerned.

In countries like England or those imitating her, no one seems to have given a serious, systematic thought to the consequences likely to arise from these wartime deve-

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

lopments. At times and in places, individual voices have been heard recalling the experience of the years following the last war, and emphasising the need to take thought for the future, to evolve order and system out of chaos. Even official Committees have been appointed to consider these matters. But such Committees are, in reality, little better than a self-delusion, a vent-pipe for parliamentary inquisitiveness, to mystify the mass, and satisfy the vanity of cranks by producing voluminous reports. These reports, however, only serve as unwanted goods in godowns, ever locked up and never visited.

The Government of India is, in this as in other routine affairs, an obedient subordinate, faithfully copying Imperial precedent. It is not for that body to think for themselves, to question or suggest, but merely to imitate the model and the method of their masters in the technique and terminology of mass mystification. But if the real character and complexity of post-war problems is emphasised by an Indian in India, it is always easy to point out that the time is not well chosen, when a world war is in progress, to think of careful study for constructive purpose of the new elements affecting the country's economic development and social organisation. Much less would it be possible, at such moments, systematically and scientifically, to keep these elemental forces under control, and direct them to the desired goal.

### NEED FOR PLANNED GROWTH IN INDIA

This is understandable, but not unanswerable. If the various schemes, experiments, or arrangements, now being made on account of the war, were confined only to the period of the war; if they were designed simply and solely to overcome the immediate obstacles, one might put up with them as the inevitable accompaniments of war. But various enterprises now being undertaken on the excuse of the war are not going to remain only while the war goes on; and come to an end automatically when the war

## INTRODUCTORY

ends. Col. Louis Johnson, personal representative of the President of the United States of America, declared and reiterated the resolve of newly planted American enterprise to quit India immediately hostilities are over. But no one has offered a similar assurance about British interests becoming vested on Indian soil. They all but monopolise chemicals, dominate sea and air transport, dictate even to steel, coal, and other primary minerals. Indian industry is invited to combine,—the more effectively to exploit Indian resources and Indian market. Without creating new fissures within the country, there can be no effective safeguard against these. Whatever enterprises are undertaken or developed under these circumstances, because of wartime necessity, will, if now left uncontrolled and unco-ordinated, become serious impediments to a planned progress of India after the war is over.

In India, again, various committees and institutions, set up to deal with problems of post-war reconstruction, are isolated, unco-ordinated offshoots, set up without any reference to a pre-concerted plan. No definite policy seems to have been adopted in setting them up or in making them work. They have no place in the permanent organisation of the country. There is thus no means to appreciate their work, or measure their progress. What fate their recommendations will meet with after the war is impossible to predict.

## CONTRAST WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

In other countries, such *ad hoc* activity may not result in irreparable harm. In Britain, the people are sovereign, who may not suffer unduly heavily by leaving this flood of change almost uncontrolled and unregulated for the moment. When the moment comes, the same sovereign authority, which suffered these forces to be, will also be able to put them under control. Western nations, moreover, still believe in the efficiency of brute force. They

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

may, therefore, comfort themselves with the belief that, if the forces now generated act after the war in any manner detrimental to the interests of the community, the community will be quite able immediately to put an end to them; and the tide of change would be directed in more acceptable channels.

A community like India,—helpless, backward, and dependent,—cannot, however, content itself with such reflections. Up till now many a scheme has been put into effect on the excuse of the war; many a vested interest come to birth, which, if continued uncontrolled for years to come, will make the post-war problem in India more and more a tangled skein. For these elements are largely of foreign origin, of foreign inspiration, dominated by foreign interests. After the war, these elements will naturally strive to make themselves permanent; and so continue unchecked their exploitation of India, even though at the moment they may be willing to give guarantees against such apprehensions. They will strive their utmost to make the problem, not of reconstruction; but only of readjustment. For my part, I fear that the moment the future popular Government of India adopts any policy, or conceals any measures calculated in the least to come in the way of such interests, the latter would immediately seek the aid of British power to prevent our Government from adopting any effective safeguards against such exploitation.

For India, therefore, to leave this flood of war time change uncontrolled as it arises, and, after it has arisen, to leave it unplanned, is doubly dangerous. War has stimulated a remarkable spurt in the output of goods, in labour as well as in consumption. If this continues at the same rate after the war, without any corresponding reorientation on the system of distribution, discontent and anarchy will grow in geometric progression. Possibly, much of the production may become unwanted. There would be no demand for the supplies now in such reckless abun-

## INTRODUCTORY

dance. The volume of labour at present engaged in enterprises connected with the war will consequently not easily find its proper place after the war, in the absence of a carefully prepared plan of national development.

### NEED OF A PRE-CONCERTED PLAN

This is not the only consideration. We must remember, also, that the end of the war will come even more unexpectedly than its beginning. The munitions and other supplies produced for the war, and the man-power engaged therein, will have to be re-assigned to their proper place on demobilisation. Careful, systematic, all-round re-organisation will, therefore, become imperative, if we do not wish universal anarchy and discontent to be the order of the day. To avoid, these, we must, even while producing commodities or services necessary for the war, and setting up administrative machinery suited to war time conditions, think of transforming and integrating them into normal peacetime system, in accordance with a pre-concerted plan, and by pre-appointed stages.

The hand-to-mouth policy of today, with the unco-ordinated administration of a number of *ad hoc* departments, intent all upon the war only, would be doubly dangerous if the war comes to an end suddenly. The vested individualist interests now being created or fostered will then inevitably cause obstruction to any attempt at radical reconstruction, which they apprehend is likely to affect them prejudicially. Every one of these will try to show that what they want is the need of the community; what ministers to their particular interests will minister to the interest of the country collectively. If not prepared now, the leaders of the community will then have no concrete plan,—and no time to make one,—for effecting post-war reconstruction. They will thus run a serious risk of falling unconscious victims to individualist interests which can shout the loudest, and organise the stoutest, ignoring or sacrificing the country's long range welfare.



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

The present may not be an ideal moment to study, investigate, and think out in all aspects the problem of reconstruction. We must remember, however, that the war has disclosed in every country inherent evils, and unhealed sores in the social system which cry out to high heavens to be remedied. And war-time experience shows us also possible remedies. Because of the war many ideas seem to have been accepted and acted upon, in regard to production and distribution of every community's wealth, which may not be welcome to vested interests when the war comes to an end. The reconstruction of production, redistribution of the wealth produced in accordance with the accepted birthright of every citizen, the re-ordering of the internal as well as international commerce and communications, together with their accessories, are all matters, so closely connected *inter se*, that without a comprehensive, all embracing plan prepared in advance, it would be impossible to escape confusion, anarchy, and despair among the people, exhausted, disgusted, disillusioned, and yet diffident because of the strain of the war.

### ANALOGY OF OTHER COUNTRIES -

In other warring countries attention is being paid to this problem, even today. Scholars and experts in America have started thinking about the root causes of wars in general, and the immediate causes of this war in particular. They have begun considering the ways and means radically to eliminate them in the future. A warless world is not merely the dream of decadent democracies. War is not among the primary urges of organised humanity or civilised society. In England, too, the Government of the day are reported to have appointed a series of Committees to study the several aspects of the complex problem post-war reconstruction is bound to present. The American President and the British Prime Minister have jointly put forward what they declare to be the governing

## INTRODUCTORY

principles,—the Atlantic Charter,—for post-war reconstruction, which they have pledged themselves to realise.

In Europe, the New Order has long since been proclaimed by Hitler; and wherever they succeed, the Nazis are trying to put it into effect. At the same time, Japan in the East professes to strive for such a New Order in Asia; while Russia has, without reference to war or any other calamity, long since established, in its vast territory and for its large population, a real new order, radically different from the system prevailing in other countries up till now.

Compared to other countries, we in India are unfortunate to a large extent. No doubt, a number of *ad hoc* committees had been appointed in India, in imitation of the British. But these are mutually unco-ordinated and work without any comprehensive plan. The bureaucratic tradition dominates their labours, and will colour their recommendations, when made to suit the interests of the British Imperialist governing class.

### INDIA'S HANDICAPS

While the Government of other countries, being independent and sovereign, can adopt all means of achieving the good of its own people, the Government of India must for ever bear in mind and act according to the interests of the British Empire. The obvious and invisible rights and interests of the British governing class cannot be overlooked or neglected, much less opposed. Even if the present Government of India desire it, they cannot and will not take all the steps that may be needed for the sole benefit of this country, particularly if any of those steps are in any way incompatible with the demands of British interests. Because we are dependent, we are backward; because we are backward, we are poor; because we are poor, we are inefficient.

These are not our only handicaps. Before the war, economic development, or industrial progress, in this

country was only nominal. Such as it was, it had been on lines which could not result in the very rapid advancement of India. The war has, undoubtedly, given a strong impetus to some industries. But they are motivated and worked so as to leave it very much open to doubt if the permanent long range prosperity of the Indian people and social justice would really be achieved.

### NEVERTHELESS NEED TO CONSIDER THE PROBLEM

Nevertheless, we must make an effort to achieve this. Just because our present government is dependent upon, and inspired by, outside interests, so that it is liable to overlook the interests of this country; just because our public administration is conducted largely by foreign personnel, liable to create or foster unnecessary obstacles to the interests of the people of India, or unable even to see these interests,—it is all the more incumbent upon the leaders of the people, and such organisations as express national sentiment, to think of such matters, even at the present moment, and put forward concrete proposals for post-war reconstruction in accordance with a pre-concerted plan.

There is another reason also for devoting thought now to this problem of post-war reconstruction. The demobilisation of the labour, and capital, men and materials, today engaged in the war, and their re-absorption organically in the peace-time social system, giving each its appropriate place, will be even more severe for us than for other more advanced and better organised countries. Considering our total population, the aggregate Indian man-power, actually engaged in fighting, may not be very great. With more than forty months of war, and a monthly average of recruitment at 50,000, an active army, navy, or air force, of over two millions already is not too high a figure. In addition, there are non-combatant services engaged in looking after this vast armed force, and supplying it with food and drink and medicine, transport

## INTRODUCTORY

and communications. This non-combatant service cannot also amount to less than a million or more.

Besides this recruitment, the labour engaged in the enterprise ministering to hostilities has also increased enormously. Adding up all the factories and workshops now engaged in preparing all kinds of war materials and accessory services, the total of such labour must, in the last three and half years, have doubled and doubled again and again. This increased labour receives, on an average, much higher pay; and that has necessarily affected its standard of living. Its pre-war standard of living was extremely poor, so that the present improvement in that standard, even if it may not be comparable to the British or American standards, is really very much greater, unlikely to be maintained when the war comes to an end, and demobilisation sets in. This large volume of manhood has come mainly from agricultural classes; and will have to be returned to peace-time occupations, to be absorbed in the ordinary working population with its sub-normal standard of living. With our yet undeveloped industries, social services and utilities, there seems no other alternative. To expect this whole mass of population to be absorbed in agriculture or its subsidiary occupations on demobilisation, and be content with their sub-normal standards after having tasted the present standards, would only be laying up a large load of discontent for the future. Thought is, therefore, doubly necessary to guard against such contingencies, to provide alternative, equivalent employment; in accordance with a comprehensive plan of all-round development.

### POTENTIALITY OF INDIA

The irony of the situation, however, lies in the fact that, though regarded as backward industrially, India does not lack in means of that development. We have an abundance of raw materials needed for every kind of industry. There is, moreover, no scarcity of the labour

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

force needed to work up this raw material. And just because of the very large number of our population, India provides a very large market, capable of incessant expansion as the people's productive capacity, purchasing power, and consuming ability increase. The only problem consists in the need to develop the people's capacity to consume and ability to produce. And for that purpose it is essential and indispensable to have some planned system, so that as and when any proportion of our labour force has to be re-absorbed, we would do so without any dislocation in the normal peace-time progressive, productive organisation.

## II

### BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

This is, perhaps, an unduly long preface. Looking to the importance and complexity of the problem, however, it was, I fear, inevitable.

Let me now turn to the main issue before us. What sort of a world it will be in which we will have to live after the war. Everybody seems agreed that, after this war, there will be an immense change. Many important changes are actually taking place before our own eyes; but they are *ad hoc*, unsystematised, unco-ordinated. Whatever may be the end of the war, and whoever becomes the victor at the end, it must be agreed even today that the world after the war will not be the world of our experience before 1939. If the Allied nations of America, Britain, Russia and China, achieve an absolute victory, and the enemy is completely defeated on the battlefield, certain changes of a radical character are most likely to be effected. Public assurances have been fromally given to this effect by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of England, in what is called the Atlantic Charter. Assuming they are true to their own declarations and consistent with the principles they profess, there is every reason to believe that these changes will be both deep-seated and far-reaching. The Atlantic Charter must be treated as a binding official declaration, which we may justly assume to be the foundation stone of the new world they design to set up after the war.

That Charter reads :

I. Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

II. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

III. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

IV. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

V. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

VI. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford the assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

VII. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

VIII. They believe that all nations of the world for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that disarmament of such nations is essential. They will, likewise, aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.

### RIGHTS OF NATIONS AND OF INDIVIDUALS

This is a declaration of certain leading ideas to govern reconstruction which has since been given the somewhat grandiose name of the Atlantic Charter. It takes its origin and inspiration chiefly from the conditions of Europe prior to 1939; and is designed, primarily, to meet European problems of that day. At the time it was pro-

claimed, the United States were not themselves at war; but their sympathies were unmistakable; and hence the association of their Chief Executive in such a declaration addressed to the whole world.

Two main trends of thought seem to have influenced the authors of this Declaration of the Rights of Nations and of individuals. Clearly, they were frightened, not only of the actual victories of the Nazis in the field; they were even more alarmed at the possibilities of the Nazi idea backed by German science, German efficiency, and German equipment. The U.S.A., were not touched, directly, by the former; but they stood to suffer the most from the latter. And the leaders of British Imperialism had their own reasons to be seriously apprehensive of the challenge of the Nazis.

On the other hand, in the background hovered the uneasy ghost of the Communist bogey. The world has yet to learn, fully and authoritatively, the secret of the Hess Mission to Britain. But there is little doubt that it was the forlorn hope, a gambler's throw, of Hitler, finding himself up against Russia. The possibilities of that immense land, throbbing with the living faith of a great Revolution, were as unfathomable as they were impossible to denounce, once Russia had been accepted as an ally. It is, however, no violence to the known sentiments of the leaders, at least of Britain, to assume that the spirit of Stalinism must be even less palatable to the plutocracy of Britain and America than that of Hitler proclaiming the inherent and indefeasible superiority of the Nordic *Herrenvolk*, whereof the Anglo-Saxon branches on either side of the Atlantic may well claim to be branches.

Between these two divergent streams of thought lies a thin strip well suited to entrap the European peoples similarly apprehensive of the Nazi juggernaut. The main ground of the Nazis for challenging the European system,



established at Versailles.—the need for lebenstraum by the have-not people,—must be remedied; equal opportunities of trade and raw-materials must be held out; and even hints at social security to the individual offered, to save them from the Nazi lair; and at the same time save them from wandering into the Communist jungle. Other peoples of the rest of the world did not appear to them, at the date of the Charter, to be anything particularly to be worried about.

## THE CHARTER BINDING—ON WHOM?

Before considering the several articles of the Charter, let us first consider how far it is binding, and on whom? As stated already, it is an act of the executive chiefs of two of the allied governments. They, no doubt, are the chief partners among the Allies. Russia and China may be more important in territory or population. The former may have hit harder, and the latter may have stayed out longer, than any other ally. But the Charter is innocent of any attempt at consulting them; and, much less, of embodying any *soupeon* of their views on post-war reconstruction. Even as regards the signatories themselves, the American Senate has not ratified, in any way, this declaration to which the American President was a party; and the American Senate has a constitutional right to be associated with the President in such matters. Even the British Parliament has in no way signified its formal endorsement of its Prime Minister's declaration. All other allies are, of course, out of the pronouncement, including the autonomous British Dominions, who, we may presume, will not be entirely mute at the Peace Conference. The other allies were neither present when the Charter was drafted, nor have they subsequently signified their adherence to its terms.

Will Russia abide by the terms, even if they might leave the possibility open for a resurrection of Germany, in some form not essentially different from today's. Or

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

will France and Poland consent? And what about neutrals, like Turkey, Spain or Sweden?

When we analyse the terms of the Articles, it will be evident that, taken collectively, it is an attempt to salvage and safeguard European civilisation, founded on individualism and motivated by commercialism, as developed and understood in Britain, and as inherited or adopted in the United States of America. The countries even of Latin America may have some caveats to enter when its terms are sought to be given effect to; while those of Asia may even have to record some demurrer, assuming they are admitted on equal terms to the Peace Conference.

If we try to make explicit all that is implied, or understood by the several clauses of this Charter, and avoid wishful thinking, or take meanings for granted, many unexpected ambiguities and complexities would be discovered. Taken as a whole, the Atlantic Charter seems intended to be a collective guarantee, by the British and American Chiefs, to all those who are fighting on their side, or who accept the ideals they profess, even though temporarily under the hold of the reactionary conqueror. But because it has been couched in language intelligible to the masses, it is capable of varied interpretation when several conflicting interests tackle the task of giving effect to it. There is, on the face of it, ample room for doubts, misgivings, or apprehensions in the absence of an authoritative gloss, which will make a shipwreck of the declaration unless adequate and authoritative elucidation is provided while there is yet time.

Taking next the consideration of the Articles serialim, the first two seem to be excellent window-dressers only. They involve no new principle of international justice, and provide no new basis for world reconstruction. Even so they are well worth enunciating, provided there are no mental reservations.

## NO ANNEXATION

Article I gives the assurance that the signatories do not desire any territorial or other aggrandisement for themselves. It is so innocuous for the promisors, that it may be quite sincerely meant. The "have-nots" can well retort, however, that at least one of them has acquired territorial possessions all over the world almost to the verge of superfluity. And the other possesses one of the richest territories on the face of the globe, not to mention a much more immense and promising sphere of influence. What sacrifice do they make in offering this assurance? Does either offer to release for common use, or return to the original owners, any part of the soil they have taken possession of? That is the acid test of their sincerity.

## TERRITORIAL READJUSTMENT

In the light of the experience after the Versailles and Trianon Treaties of 1919, the assurance (Article II), likewise, regarding no territorial changes being allowed, which are not in accordance with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, is ambiguous. The "freely expressed wishes of the people concerned" are possible to manage or manipulate. They are liable to be influenced by sentimental or traditional reasons, rather than by material considerations. When the former are in conflict with the latter, they do not always prevail.

If effect is given literally to this principle, the world may probably have to be parcelled out into an immense congerie of microscopic states, who would neither be able each effectively to develop their local resources, nor maintain their own integrity, peace, or order within their frontiers. The door would, again, be flung wide open to all the petty jealousies which have flooded the world with the present blood bath.

A standard unit, sufficient to give adequate scope for local development, with adequate resources and popula-

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

tion, must be set up before such a declaration can be regarded as contributing effectively for a sane world reconstruction. And even though the standard dimensions or requirements may not be rigidly maintained or insisted upon in all cases, the presence of such a basis for reconstruction would serve as a useful check upon unduly flissiparous tendencies.

A clear definition must also be provided as to what would constitute a "people". The term implies a degree of geographic unity and cultural homogeneity, which would be a guarantee of internal harmony and consistent co-operation to add to their own as well as the world's wealth in the aggregate. But where are such peoples to be found? And such as they are may not have the material complement of economic resources sufficient to ensure proportionate return to their labour. The reconstructors must take care, if their achievements are not to belie their intentions, that these points are carefully elucidated before a new world can be said to have been established.

### RESTORATION OF LOST SOVEREIGNTY

The doubts and misgivings, referred to already, inevitable in interpreting the declaration, are reinforced by the events which have happened since it was issued. Take, for example, our own position, and read it in the light of clauses III and IV of the Charter. The right to determine a country's own constitution,—presumably in accordance with the ideals accepted by its own people,—is guaranteed by the Charter only to those whose sovereign rights and self-government have been forcibly taken away.

Does India come within the terms of the clause?

The sovereign rights and self-government of this country have been taken away by force; but not in recent times; nor by the Nazis, the Fascists, or the fire-eaters of Japan. But, does that make any difference in principle? Why should

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

not that which applies to Rumania, Abyssinia, or Manchuria, apply also to India? It is a fact of history that India has had her independence taken away, and still denied, by British imperialism. A century or more may have elapsed since the rape of India. But time is only an accident. There should be no immunity by prescription, while we profess to be rebuilding the world free from strife, domination, and exploitation? There is no mention in the whole Charter about India. That seems a very remarkable omission, which cannot but detract from the universal and unconditional acceptability of the Charter.

As it stands, the meaning and purpose of this clause seem to be: that only those communities, whose independence has been forced away by the Nazis or the Fascists or the Japanese will have it restored to them; and the peoples of those countries only will be entitled to choose the form of government under which they will live. As for the other luckless peoples, who, in the inscrutable dictates of Providence, have fallen under the dominating influence of Britain,—the Charter makes it more than doubtful if they can be correctly called independent people. And as Britain is America's ally, the junior partner cannot easily question the doings of the senior member of the firm. India may have made substantial contribution, in blood and treasure, in this as well as the last war. But India remains the only considerable territory where British Imperialism has still scope for exploitation for the benefit of the British governing class. Naturally they do not wish to part with that which is the only remaining source of their power and glory, their wealth and prestige.

Japan, again, has taken away, by force, the independence of Burma and Malaya. But if the Allied nations are victorious, and Japan is forced to disgorge the fruits of her conquest, it may be questioned if the local population of those places would get their independence. British Imperialism may be trusted to discover or invent one or

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

another camouflage—trusteeship or mandate—to remain in the saddle even in those parts. Lloyd George and Clemenceau, between them, quietly castrated Wilson's League of Nations, making it a perfectly domesticated registry office for Britain and France. Roosevelt has more experience. But does that alone arm him sufficiently against the diplomacy or duplicity of his ally?

There is yet another point in Article III of the Charter which has more than a germ of future trouble. The authors of the Charter respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they would live. But what would happen if any people chose a form of government which is in frank opposition to the ideals the Allies have accepted for post-war world reconstruction? Will they deny them the right they have so magniloquently announced? Would they compel any people, e.g. the Germans or the Italians, to fall into line,—by force if need be? Will non-conformity have no room in the new world?

The experience of this country deeply reinforces all these doubts, and strongly advises that the ambiguities in the Charter be cleared up as soon as possible. She has been nourishing ambitions for her national independence for a long time now. Under stress of war, they have even been accepted, in principle, by the British Imperial Government. In substance, however, whenever opportunity has arisen, they have managed, on one or another pretext, to deny it. Taking the latest example of the Cripps offer, the internal differences, or conflict of interests between the Indian people, was made an excuse for withholding the right to full independence. The necessity for an efficient conduct of hostilities offered a providential pretext, which they were too seasoned veterans in imperialist diplomacy to overlook. Quick as a sunstroke they withdrew the offer (sic), leaving no time to any allied opinion to enquire if conflicts of interest in different classes were utterly absent in any other country, Bri-

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

tain included. To China and America they magnified a million fold the danger of leaving the conduct of war on the Indian front to mere politicians, even after the British experts had proved their organising genius and military ability in Burma or Malaya, in Crete and Singapore. With sanctimonious smugness, which only the British non-conformist conscience can command, they stressed to America the risk of our communal differences militating against the singleness of purpose in a mixed politicians' government of independent India, without giving the latter the ghost of a chance to enquire if there were such communal differences in Burma also? And what was the British record in Burma?

### EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN TRADE AND RAW MATERIALS

Assurance has also been given in the Charter (Article IV) that all states, large or small, victor or vanquished, will be given equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world, needed for their economic prosperity.

Now, what does this equality of access to all states in regard to trade and raw materials mean? The term "State" has not been defined in the Charter. In fact they use the terms—country, people, state—quite indiscriminately. But assuming it to mean a political entity with sovereign powers, recognised in international intercourse as such, it is obvious that this is designed to reassure those European powers who are in great need of foodstuffs as well as raw materials for their industry. Some of these, particularly the smaller ones, had found in the past many obstacles to their foreign commerce,—usually a nemesis of their own policy of intense economic nationalism, copied by their neighbours or customers.

The larger and more powerful amongst them,—also deficit units in point of food or raw materials of industry,—resorted to Imperialist exploitation of other countries; and if that could not help, took to aggression upon their neighbours to make good the deficiency in their own

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

natural endowment. And therein lay a fruitful, perennial cause of war. This Article was consequently inserted simply to take away their urge for economic nationalism, exploitive Imperialism, or military aggression, by assuring them an adequate supply of food and raw materials to enable them to develop their own resources.

But what about countries which are not deficient in their own local food supply, or raw materials of industry? They may have their own industrial possibilities which can use up all their available raw materials. Will they not have a primary, preferential, pre-emptive claim on these, their own raw materials? Or, must they be forever denied the right to develop, with their own labour, their own industrial possibilities? Or, did the authors of the Charter consider it the fore ordained destiny of such countries to be forever the suppliers of foodstuffs and raw materials to the *Herrenvolk* of Europe,—themselves remaining simply agricultural lands, providing an easy dumping ground for the industrial wares of the chosen peoples?

### REACTION UPON BACKWARD COUNTRIES

This needs but to be stated to expose the lack of a due sense of justice, and equality of treatment to all peoples, in the authors of the Charter. Countries like India or China, which may at present be largely producers of foodstuffs or raw materials of industry, have their own legitimate ambitions for industrial development of their own resources to raise the subnormal standard of living now prevalent in those people. If, therefore, in the desire to take away from the deficit European countries an eternal cause of conflict by remedying their economic needs, a world policy is adopted which precludes or obstructs hitherto undeveloped and impoverished countries from developing their own resources, would the causes of war have been effectively eliminated for ever? The only result would be that their virulence would be transplanted from the West to the East.



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

No programme, indeed, for post-war world reconstruction would be worth considering, which doubts or denies in any way the equal right of all countries to seek their own development to the maximum capacity. The only guarantee their neighbours can justly demand of such backward countries, with rich promise of development, is that they shall not carry on the process of their own development so as to obstruct the similar right of others to such development; and that, if they have an unwanted abundance of any material or resources, over and above their own needs, they shall agree to supply, out of their surplus or speciality, what may be needed by another, on reasonable terms.

The careful insertion, moreover, of the saving clause—"with due respect to their existing obligations"—is highly intriguing. The "existing obligations" were incurred in the days when economic nationalism was running riot in response to imperialist exploitation. A most complicated network of tariffs and quotas, preferences and reciprocities, and clearing house agreements had been evolved, which made international commerce a tangled skein impossible to unravel. It is, professedly, to undo the mischief wrought by that age of unblushing national selfishness and unabashed imperialism, that this war is supposed to have started. Are we going to keep these devices in tact? What else is the meaning of "due regard to existing obligations." If all such—or similar—obligations of Britain or America are to be regarded as sacrosanct, modifiable, if at all, with their consent, we must bid goodbye to any hope of returning sanity and permanent peace.

India has no lack of raw materials. Thanks to her very large population, there is no need to fear lack of market either. But, compared to her resources and population, she is industrially backward; and the average standard of living for her people is much below normal. Her real needs are in regard to industrial development. To achieve that the raw materials produced within her

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

boundaries may have to be conserved and utilised for the development and expansion of her own local industry. At the same time, to absorb the finished goods produced within the country, she may need to safeguard or protect her own local markets for the benefit of her developing industries, especially if the regime of individualist enterprise and competitive commerce continues after the war in any shape or degree. There is nothing in the Charter to warrant the belief that the regime of competitive commerce would for ever be ended after this war.

For India, therefore, this particular clause in the Atlantic Charter is more alarming than reassuring. For, if, in accordance with it, she is compelled, by some international authority or organisation, that may be set up after the war, to export her raw materials without any safeguard for her own industries, and to admit foreign goods to compete with her own local industries,—i.e., on an equal footing,—she can never develop her industries to their maximum or even optimum capacity.

### PROBLEM OF NON-NATIONAL VESTED INTERESTS

This is the more dangerous for such as us, as the Charter makes no reference at all to such problems as the safeguards for the interests of one country having become vested in another. The vested interests of British capitalists in India have already provoked bitter resentment in Indian nationalist circles on account of the so-called anti-discrimination provisions in the latest Government of India Act, 1935. If that position is perpetuated in another shape, India cannot but take it as a death knell of her industrial ambitions. Explicit declaration must accordingly be made regarding the status of the nationals of one country settled in another, until a common world citizenship is evolved.

The Charter spells, in effect, grave peril to such backward communities in the economic field. The right of each community to develop to the maximum capacity its own

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

resources, and to minister to its own needs, must, I think, be postulated as the *sine qua non* of any attempt at acceptable reconstruction, any assurance of permanent, abiding peace in the world. The four freedoms of President Roosevelt would, if this right is not declared, accepted, and guaranteed, be empty bombast, at least for such as us in this country. And the Charter will be only a warrant and authority for the powerful exploiter to continue their process, with the full moral(?) backing of their fellows based upon this Charter.

It is not intended, of course, by requiring the postulate of every community's right to develop its own resources to their maximum capacity, that such local development should operate so as to render impossible world trade, or facilitate economic aggression on any less well-gifted or less developed community by another more so. That was the unmitigated bane of the pre-war European economy. Every care must be taken to prevent a resurrection of its ghost in the post-war world. India will of course be ready to give any reasonable guarantees in this behalf. Nor need it be insisted that the results of such development should be reserved exclusively for the benefit of the community developing, even if such fruits are far in excess of the needs of the developing community. The first claim of the community developing those resources must, of course, be recognised, making full allowance for its continuing development. But when all the reasonable needs of that community have been met, the surplus, if any, should be made available to any other community needing any part of such surplus produce, on reasonable terms collectively negotiated and agreed upon.

So far as this country is concerned, the National Planning Committee has already accepted the view, put forward by the Chairman, that the aim of our national plan is to make the country self-sufficient. That does not mean, however, that our national self-sufficiency should enable Indian produce to be dumped on foreign

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

markets. No people should be entitled, by its superior development, in any way to jeopardise the equal rights of any other community to bring about the latter's local development, with its own labour and by its own capital. No country must in the post-war world be suffered to pursue, even on the collective national plane, a policy of selfish aggrandisement, which, on the individual plane, is the root of all those jealousies and rivalries that lead to class cleavage and international conflicts.

So long as any people have not had the opportunity to develop their local resources to their utmost capacity, the aggregate wealth of the world will not be increased to the extent it can be. And if the aggregate wealth of the world does not increase as human science, ingenuity and organisation can make it, the distribution of the available wealth will be inadequate, however just and reasonable the basis for that distribution may be. With distribution thus suffering, the standard of living of the people will also suffer. The improvement in the average standard of living among all the inhabitants of the world must be among the fundamental aims of post-war reconstruction; and every step to achieve it must be tested by this one rule: Will it, or will it not, improve the all-round standard of living all over the world?

It is for this reason that we have postulated above, among the universally accepted and guaranteed rights of communities forming part of the reconstructed world, the right to develop local resources, with local labour and capital, to meet all local needs as far as possible. As a corollary, we have also added the obligation on every community to exchange its *surplus*, or *speciality*, to meet other communities' needs, on reasonable terms collectively negotiated and agreed upon. The Charter, however, is silent on this crucial issue; and unless a satisfactory explanation is obtained on this point, the Charter with all its implications will be impossible to accept to many communities

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

now generally sympathising with the aims of that declaration.

The explanation must also make definite the guarantees which would be demanded, as a condition precedent to reconstruction on these lines, for the interests of one community having become rooted in another; and demanding specially favourable treatment, even at the expense of the community in which they have become vested. No sound programme of reconstruction would be feasible, so long as the slightest excuse is left for anything like the Sudetan demands in Czecho-Slovakia. In this country, the guarantees hitherto demanded by and accorded to British capitalists rooted in the land have provoked the keenest resentment from all indigenous elements seeking the industrial revival of their country for their benefit and by their own labour. The age of privilege for the imperialist nations and their nationals elsewhere must end for ever. If the Britisher chooses to be permanently resident and domiciled in India, and so becomes for ever identified with this country in its weal or woe, we should not, and will not, discriminate against him. But if he chooses to remain an outsider, in a position specially entrenched, privileged, and safeguarded; and if that position is reinforced by collective international guarantees—such as might be read into some of the clauses of the Charter—peoples of the world situated as we are will never be satisfied. And what applies to the Britisher in India must apply to the Indian in Burma or Ceylon.

## INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

The remaining clauses of the Charter enunciate principles, which, in the absence of any indication of a definite machinery to give effect to them, sound very much like platitudes. Thus, for example, in Article V, "they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing for all improved standards, economic advancement and

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

social security." But this "collaboration" has yet to be organised, particularly because there are today conflicting interests in the "economic field." If this collaboration is to be a reality, and not a platitude, the wealth of the world will have to be shared more evenly than European nations, and even America, have hitherto done. More pious wishes of this kind will not serve the purpose. Besides, such collaboration needs to be organised into a working machinery equal to deal with all the corners and obstacles inherent in the situation. "Collaboration" between nations, as a condition precedent to improved labour standards, is feasible as well as unquestionable in principle. But if any real improvement in standards of living is to be an accomplished fact, if social security is to be enjoyed by all, it is imperative that the political and economic emancipation be first assured to each and all.

## UNIVERSAL SAFETY AND SECURITY

As a specimen of this guarantee, they lay down, in Article VI, the hope of a world peace, which will afford to all nations the means of living in safety in their own territories. Mere security from aggression, however, would still leave backward nations no great hope of economic advancement, unless the collaboration promised in Article V becomes a reality. Adequate measures must also be taken to see that this peace is not only achieved, but also maintained. The insurgent or reactionary ambitions of any nation, such as those which broke through the League of Nations, must have no chance left to them to reassert themselves, and endanger world peace, simply for lack of any machinery effectively to restrain them.

The last clause of this Article, assuring to all men in all lands a life of freedom from fear and want, depends for its realisation upon: (i) sufficient economic advancement in their own region; (ii) abolition of privileged classes—the proprietors—now taking up for themselves all surplus value created by labour; and (iii) possibility of

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

sharing by collaboration corresponding development of other regions, especially where one's own country is either deficient or backward.

### FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

Article VII is clearly a platitude. Freedom of movement to every one in air, over the high seas and oceans without hindrance, is an undisputed right of the individual, which, in peacetime, no one will care to dispute. When applied, however, to war-time conditions, the belligerents in self-defence may put restrictions on the movements of neutral ships, goods, or persons, which may not accord with this declaration. The only remedy is a total extinction of war as a means of international settlement.

It is permissible to question if this right of individuals to free movement everywhere, for business or pleasure, will not affect the anti-immigration legislation in countries like the United States. What guarantees are offered against this symbol of non-collaboration on the American, Australian, or African Statute Book? Conversely, what protection will be available against the unrestricted intrusion of undesirable aliens? The Charter is provokingly silent on these matters.

### ABANDONMENT OF FORCE

Article VIII is a little more ambitious, though the mention of "spiritual reasons" does give it a certain air of pretentiousness. The belief of the framers of the Charter that all nations will abandon force as an instrument of settling international differences has yet to be realised in fact even by the authors of the document themselves; and much more so by the Allies engaged in the present war. Not a word is said about the necessity of compulsory arbitration in the international differences.

As a concrete step towards achieving their ideal, however, the framers of the Charter declare, in this Article: "Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or

## BASIS FOR RECONSTRUCTION

air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that disarmament of such nations is essential." This is a one-sided programme of disarmament, which, on the face of it, invites opposition. Every attempt at disarmament in the years before the war failed miserably because it was sought to be made a one-sided infliction upon certain countries only. If disarmament is to be real and effective, it must be universal and simultaneous. Whatever the strength of conviction of the authors of the Charter regarding the menace to world peace from certain quarters, they would be guilty of a grave political blunder, if they insist upon disarmament only of certain countries, simply because in the recent past these have caused breaches in the world peace.

The last sentence in that Article has very little meaning beyond a pious hope in favour of all practical measures to lighten the burden of armament on peace-loving people, itself a question-begging term.

The Charter, therefore, as it stands, is capable of interpretation, based on past experience, not fully conformable to the demands of social justice on the international plane. Nor is it in full harmony with the economic possibilities of each unit as well as of the whole world.



### III

## WORLD REORGANISATION

The two leading nations among the Allies profess to establish universal and abiding peace among nations, secure collaboration between them in the economic field, and maintain individual freedom from want as well as national freedom from foreign domination. But if this declaration is to be read in the spirit the signatories have publicly professed, a radical change in world organisation must ensue. For while, up to now, the leading nations of Europe had taken it to be their birthright to exploit and dominate, according to the terms of this Charter, such exploitation over other countries must and for ever be annihilated.

As an inevitable corollary of this, the exploitation of any one class by another even in the same country must also be abolished.

But who shall ensure this abolition and annihilation? What will be the concrete steps to put an end to aggressive imperialism? What will be the authority to take them in hand; and how and when they shall be put into effect, have yet to be made explicit. The Charter is distressingly silent on these most interesting issues; and any conclusions we draw from collateral reading can at best be only inferences.

### A WORLD SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY

To give full effect to the express provisions or inevitable implications of the Charter, particularly as regards claims of social justice among individuals and international security, a specific authority must be set up charged

## WORLD REORGANISATION

with the duty to give effect to this, or any other similar basis for post-war world reconstruction.

A paramount, all-powerful, world sovereign State, armed with adequate authority, must be set up for this purpose. This sovereign, international authority must be expressly empowered and enabled to intervene to maintain international peace and collaboration, and ensure economic justice to individual citizens. For the latter purpose, it must also be entitled to intervene in the internal administration of any community to ensure due fulfilment of the guaranteed fundamental rights of individuals as well as of communities. This central authority will have not only always to remain wide awake; it must, as and when necessary, use its power and authority to prevent any undesirable elements asserting themselves. It must have the rights as well as the means to nip in the bud any tendency to revolt. In consequence, in every country, the sovereignty of the local government would have to be restricted, not only with regard to international relations, but even, at times, in regard to the internal administration. For, the common rights of humanity, vitally affecting human life, social organisation, economic development, and cultural progress, must be declared and guaranteed by the international sovereign. It may also colour profoundly our laws, customs and ideals that have prevailed for centuries.

Particular communities may quite conceivably decline to carry out such changes, or at least silently oppose. In such cases, the central sovereign authority must have the power and authority to enforce the rights it has guaranteed.

## UNIVERSAL AND SIMULTANEOUS DISARMAMENT

Such a world sovereign must be the creature of its constituents. But once created, it must have supreme authority and effective powers to keep in check any reactionary or refractory elements among its creators. If

the letter as well as the spirit of the assurances given in the Atlantic Charter are to be realised, many highly armed, powerful nations of today will have to be compulsorily disarmed. A sort of universal Arms Act must be promulgated, prohibiting the making or use of specified armaments by any constituent unit of the World Sovereign authority. At the same time, the land and other productive resources of the weaker communities, which their powerful neighbours have taken possession of and are exploiting for the latter's own benefit, must be reclaimed and returned to the original owners. The manpower of such subjugated countries, converted into wage-slaves by the imperialist exploiter, must likewise be freed, and safeguarded against any recurrence of such domination and exploitation. All should be equal members of a common consortium and a co-operative world association, and their collective representative alone should have all the power and the might and the glory of its constituent units put together.

### ELIMINATE INDIVIDUAL EXPLOITATION

If social justice as between individuals is to be an accomplished fact, the exploitive elements—capitalist and land-owning classes—within each given community must likewise be deprived of their power to exploit. Except in Russia, this internal exploitation has everywhere been accepted as the natural order. Will the Charter put an end to this internal exploitation of class by class? If so, all the existing laws, and the entire social system based upon class differences, will have to be recast fundamentally. And if the local governing authority in any country refuses to accept this ideal of social justice as between individual citizens, if it persists in maintaining exploiting classes, the central world authority must have the means and the power to make it fall into line.

But does the Charter really contemplate such a radical change? Even if its authors intended so, it cannot be

## WORLD REORGANISATION

achieved without bringing about a wholesale revolution internally in many countries, allied as well as enemy. Nor can such a revolution, even if brought about by the help of the principal allies, be maintained without constant, irritating interference with the internal administration of each nation. Another clause, however, of the same Charter envisages constant interference in the internal administration of any country as undesirable and unacceptable. How then can its authors hope to make good their promises in every-day life?

### AS WELL AS INTERNATIONAL

The same problems which face us in regard to the internal administration of each country are also present in regard to the international relations. Just as, within each community, the capitalist or propertied classes exploit the have-nots, so, on the international plane, rich and powerful nations have been up till now systematically exploiting the relatively weaker, poorer, or backward nations. Britain is, of course, the classic example of such universal exploitation tempting even to the Nazi leader. If now it is genuinely desired to stop this international exploitation, some supreme world sovereign must be established, to which every (independent) country must be made answerable. Just as within each sovereign nation of today, individuals when they differ from one another are not allowed to resort to force to determine their differences, but must leave it to the judicial authority to distribute justice, so also a supreme World State must be set up to ensure and maintain international justice without recourse to arms. Universal arbitration in all cases of international differences must be the unexceptioned rule, if the new order is to endure in the post-war world for any length of time.

### CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD SOVEREIGN

The constitution and function of this paramount world sovereign have not been even broadly outlined in the

Atlantic Charter. Nor is there a hint regarding the mode or process of its institution. If we overlook the short-lived experiments in the past of extensive empires like the Roman, we have so far no precedent upon which the new World State may be moulded. We are, therefore, somewhat at sea as regards the mode of its birth, its shape, its growth and function. The only fixed point is that we must have this world authority, as a means of escape from the mess and the tangle international relations had become; and that in consequence, **local sovereignty of every constituent unit of the World State should be abolished.**

Notwithstanding the high sounding ideals professed by those who lead in the struggle against Nazidom, there is reason to fear that powers like the British, seasoned by centuries of imperialism, and calloused by universal exploitation, will not consent easily to relinquish any part of their local or imperial sovereignty. The solution of this vexed problem depends, no doubt, in a very large measure, upon the end the present way may have. But if we desire for ever to eradicate the exploitive principle throughout the world, as is implied in the Atlantic Charter, the present economic differences between the various states, which make one a surplus and another a deficit community, will have to be redressed by this collective world authority.

One of the excuses that the present leaders of Germany had urged was that Germany had, as a result of the Versailles Treaty, become one of the have-not nations. Notwithstanding the German people being highly advanced, with a very considerable scientific organisation and disciplined labour; notwithstanding their ingenuity and enterprise, they were unable to obtain on even terms all the raw materials necessary for their highly developed industry. Even food supplies needed for Germany's large population were not available from her own local resources. The output of its industry,—varied, excellent, and considerable as it was,—was often useless for want of an adequate

market. The inadequacy of her market she ascribed to the deprivation of the colonies Germany had acquired before the war. Her wealth of science was consequently in vain; her labour capacity going waste; her mechanical advances of no avail.

Between 1919 and 1939, moreover, every big and small nation was intent upon a policy of economic nationalism to achieve its own self-sufficiency. It was largely because of this that Germany was unable to export with advantage the surplus of her industrial production to her neighbours. This surplus went on accumulating every year, not even taken in satisfaction of the inconceivably heavy burden of Reparations forced upon her by the victorious allies after the war of 1914-18. Germany was, therefore, driven to refuse to acknowledge and discharge these unjust burdens, and eventually to rectify her wrongs by force of arms.

The same is the case with Italy, regarding her aggression on Abyssinia. In the East, Japan is following on identical lines. Even Britain, disregarding all claims of international justice, decided, in 1931, to drop her Gold Standard; and, at the same time, to decline to pay the instalments of her war debt to America. In brief, this is a vicious circle in which one injustice leads to another, till the accumulation becomes a maze from which war appears as the only release; and war nowadays on a world scale spells the collapse of the whole social system. If this experience is to be avoided, we must get at the very root of these international as well as social injustices.

Though a narrow, intensive economic nationalism and insatiate greed prevailed everywhere, every community had not sufficient raw materials, labour, power, scientific equipment, or adequate market to absorb the finished goods produced by such hectic industrialisation. As such industrialisation, moreover was carried out under individualist enterprise, the demands of social justice were neglected. The result was a volume of internal discontent and unemployment, which inevitably became an easy prey to fascist forces seeking their own satisfaction out of this turmoil.

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Large sections of the world, on the other hand, like India or China, lacked the necessary mechanical equipment to realise their industrial ambitions, and develop their own resources. Notwithstanding their immense man-power, their economic development was restricted. Their economic strength and political influence were consequently much less than those of less advantageously situated European powers. Advanced European nations had always considered such countries and their people as their legitimate (?) prey for exploitation. The same has happened in South America, South Africa, and in the islands of the Pacific. Everywhere European, American, or Japanese exploiting machinery was at work. In all those countries, the local produce of raw materials was taken up for manufacturing industry in those other countries; and the manufactured products of the latter's factories were exported for dumping in the less developed regions. Dumping became, in fact, a virulent plague, if, in the same market, two or more of these imperialist exploiters were in competition. The result was a variety of mutually incompatible and conflicting interests among these imperialist exploiters, which in the end led to war.

### EVOLUTION OF FASCISM AT HOME

Before, however, having recourse to naked force, it was necessary that these advanced, industrialised, dissatisfied states should themselves be satisfied, if not satiated, united and consolidated within themselves. They must eradicate their local differences and parties; and achieve armed strength sufficient to make head against the entrenched position of the older imperialisms. The new leaders of these dissatisfied nations were resolved upon war as the only arbiter. And as the conduct of large scale war would not be compatible with divided counsels, or party differences, everywhere in such countries the new regime strove to suppress political freedom by force. Arising originally to rectify the inherent injustice of the Versailles settlement, they gradually tended to suppress anything that smacked in the least of the factors which had made

## WORLD REORGANISATION

Versailles at all possible. And so, in course of time, they developed an absolutist political organisation, with rigid discipline and concentration of power in the hands of a Führer or Duce. Such a leader, once installed, hastened to abolish all constitutional restrictions on his own absolutism. Being brand new, he had, of course, no traditional limits to his authority.

### AND AGGRESSION ABROAD

Having put down popular freedom within their own frontiers, these dictators started terrorising their neighbours. For a while their gangster tactics succeeded. And when the policy of intimidation and terrorism had achieved its aims with regard to their weaker neighbours, they resorted to armed conflict, to wrench the domination of the world from the better entrenched and more powerful imperialisms of the pre-war world. Because they had been intensively preparing for war for a long time, they met with resounding successes at first. But these have not been maintained in the years that followed. With the passage of years, the so-called democracies of the West have proved themselves not altogether decadent and effete, even though they did prove themselves to be scandalously lax itself into a race of staying power, productive capacity, or inefficient. The war, therefore, is steadily transmitting organising ability, and fighting quality of the War-lords and the war machines of the two sides. If we want to put an end to these causes and process of the present war, and to eliminate it for ever from the reconstructed post-war world, we will have to reverse the entire course of evolution, destroying its very roots.

### NATIONAL SELF-SUFFICIENCY—ITS LIMITATIONS

This, however, will not be achieved merely by trumpeting forth pious intentions, such as those contained in the Atlantic Charter. If any Article of the Charter seems in practice more honoured in the breach than observance, it would cause natural distrust. That document is extremely confused, complicated, and contradictory. If we scru-



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

tinise carefully its various clauses and read them together, the essence of post-war world reconstruction envisaged therein seems to be: that each country, whatever the term may signify, should be made self-sufficient. Where self-sufficiency is not attainable, they aim at mutual aid to make up the deficit. But is it possible that every constituent unit can be fully self-sufficient? If we exclude the vast and well endowed units,—like the United States, Russia, China, or India,—there is hardly a single country which can ordinarily maintain itself from its own resources, with a reasonably decent scale of living to its population. We cannot describe, of course, artificial conglomerates like the British Commonwealth as units in this sense. Everywhere else, where there are resources, there is no adequate population. If there is population, there is lack of mechanical or scientific complements. Where there is labour, there is no market. Where there is market, there is no produce to supply the market. Where there are means there is no equipment. Where there are materials, there is no organisation to bring them to fruition. And, bar Russia, nowhere is there a consistent, coherent, co-ordinated, scientific plan.

Even of the four instances of vast, well-endowed, and well-populated units, two at least, though considerable in area, resources, and population,—India and China,—are industrially backward, and politically dependent. Notwithstanding their very large population and potentialities, they are without wealth, without power, without self-confidence. They have not either the equipment and organization to start their forward march; or their road is blocked by selfish foreign interests rooted on their soil.

The case of Russia is unique to show the possibilities of planned progress. The United States is the only single unit, considerable in area, rich in population, well endowed by nature and in human ingenuity, where it is possible to contemplate material achievement on the highest scale and self-sufficiency, leading to a very satisfactory standard

## WORLD REORGANISATION

of living. That is why that country is averse to any methods of aggression or imperialistic exploitation of other communities. And that is why, too, the assurance given by its President may be treated as more dependable than that by the Prime Minister of the most seasoned veteran of the imperialist band.

### UNBALANCED ECONOMY

For all other countries, self-sufficiency is misleading, impossible, or dangerous to the rest of the world. From the standpoint of natural endowment, a country like Britain, though wealthy and powerful today, is dependent, even for its food and raw materials of industry, upon foreign trade. The casual eye does not see this because of their imperialist might, authority or influence. Britain is unable to produce much of the material it needs itself, and is unable to consume much of what it produces. And her imports are at least more than half as much again as her exports. Nearly three-fourths of her food and industrial raw materials have to be imported, and more than half the produce of her industry exported. She is an example *par excellence* of that economic perversion and monstrosity called production primarily for exchange, and not for use.

This being her natural economic position, Britain has had to hold colonial possessions in every country. And in every such country she has had to develop her imperial authority, by hook or crook, to maintain this position. If her flag has followed her trade, her trade requires her flag to be always kept flying at any cost. But the war has made an irreparable breach in her stronghold of accumulated wealth. Her centuries old sovereignty of the seas and lands beyond her island home is imperilled. Much of the so-called Empire of Britain—Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand—is no longer integral parts of an Empire except in name; and some of them unwilling to be so nominally. Burma, Malaya, and a number of large or small islands in the Pacific, have been lost to Japan. India

demands her national independence, and fights for it, and is sure to get it tomorrow, if not today.

With all this, her local resources cannot suffice for the local population, even so far as the absolute essentials of life and industry are concerned. Hitherto Britain had carried on because, thanks to its imperialist power and its universal exploitation, it had become powerful and wealthy. It was able to appropriate for its own use the fruits of other people's labour, and so build up vast reserves of wealth, which are, however, being rapidly used up in this world war. She lived for long generations on the sweat of other people's brow. But now that privileged position will not last. For, if after the war, thanks to the institution of a World State and international sovereign authority, this kind of exploitation of other countries is put an end to, the strength, wealth, credit and prestige Britain has enjoyed all the world over for centuries must decline and disappear.

### THE CHARTER AND IMPERIALIST DIPLOMACY

The Atlantic Charter is silent on this subject,—unless one does some wishful thinking, or reads carefully between the lines. Before its implications are put into effect, past experience provides ample reason to fear that Britain will intrigue her utmost to convince or confuse her allies, to coerce her satellites, to escape or evade the consequences of the assurances given or implied by the Charter. Facts necessitate it; experience demands it.

It may be that, with the United States and Russia as her allies, the crooked diplomacy which triumphed at Versailles may not succeed at Moscow or Washington. Roosevelt is not the visionary Wilson, poisoned by flattery to a premature grave. The lessons of Versailles are not quite forgotten at Washington, any more than at Berlin, Moscow, or Ankara. Before, however, the reconstructed world is brought into being on the ideals implicit in the Charter, and Britain gets her due place therein, it is of the utmost importance that some central world sovereign

should be set up, with power and authority to guard against being made a mere tool of a new edition of imperialism and exploitation.

This does not apply exclusively to Britain. With the possible exception of France, and, of course, of Russia, the leading nations of Europe are all deficit countries, where demand is always greater than supply, and where, consequently, the deficit must be made up by foreign trade, or colonial exploitation.

So long as certain countries are called "great powers," and others are their mere clients; some more extensive, and others starved for space; some dense with population, poor and sickly, ignorant and inefficient, while others rich in resources, but lacking in manpower to develop these resources, it would be impossible to avoid mutual jealousies and rivalries. These rivalries, if left to go on smouldering, must some day blaze forth in a world-wide conflagration again.

It may be that the difference in the area and the population of the several national units existing today may not be necessary,—not even feasible, perhaps,—immediately to abolish. But the difference as between a State and a State, in area, wealth, resources, and population, leading to threats of territorial aggression on pain of permitting exploitation of the weaker by the stronger, must be recognised to be the root cause of wars. And so, if we desire to eliminate for ever the very seed of future wars, and implement substantially guarantees like those of this Charter, a central co-ordinating machinery, to make world co-operation a living reality, is indispensable.

#### IV

### PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

#### **WANTED—(A) CENTRAL CO-ORDINATING MACHINERY**

This machinery must be framed by common consent. It must function impartially, and not as an agent or tool of any particular state or group of states. The consenting constituent states must part with, or delegate, sufficient power and authority to this central organisation to make it an instrument of close co-operation and all-round reconstruction. It must, accordingly, be entrusted with the command of all the armed forces of all the countries now maintaining their own separate establishments, and vested with the ownership, control and management of all kinds of munitions or armament industries. **No country should thereafter be allowed to have its separate army, navy, or air force, nor any industry which caters for these services.**

#### **(B) WORLD CITIZENSHIP**

A new conception of common, equal, universal world citizenship must be evolved at the same time and given effect to. We must abolish divergent or conflicting allegiances. The entire world population must come under the common sovereignty of the World State. The latter must be bound to provide for each country, on an equal footing, its protection and assistance. For then only will every people be able to live its own life in peace and security; to develop its own culture, to achieve its own economic prosperity. **The doctrine of individual sovereignty must be discarded; the virtue of patriotism discounted; the sentiment of nationalism declared a crime. A world of common allegiance and equal opportunity, in name as well**

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

as in fact; a world of identical loyalties, common sympathies, and mutual understandings, where the germ of rivalry flourishes only in service to one's fellows, and not in sterile self-seeking for mutual exploitation; where the spur and stimulus to work lies, not in the greed of gain, but in the desire for self-expression, self-realisation, self-fulfilment; where the motto is "all for each and each for all."

World collaboration, thus made a working reality, would lead to a substantial increase in the aggregate world wealth, both material and spiritual. And this increased wealth, justly distributed, must ensure freedom from want and suffering for every human being throughout the world.

Even if absolute equality between the several peoples of the world in respect of population and area, natural endowment or man-made wealth, is impossible to achieve, we must nevertheless guard against the undesirable consequences of such initial inequality manifesting themselves. Modern science can devise means which would put an end even to the seeming inequalities of natural endowment and physical attainment. These methods must be tried to rectify the excess of population over resources, or of resources over population, in one country as compared to another.

### (C) REDISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION

An agreed wholesale redistribution of population among the several countries all over the world seems the best solution. The result will be that, after determining, with reference to each unit area, the number of people that could be satisfactorily maintained in a given standard of civilised existence from the resources of that area, the world population would be so distributed as to bring about this standard or optimum density all over the several communities, and assure an equal all-round pace of development.

This does not mean that there would be an absolute numerical equality as between China and Chili, India and

Australia, Britain and Brazil. Climatic and geographic conditions may, no doubt, influence the actual number to be supported in every single unit. Tradition, temperament, or mere inertia, may militate against individual migration from the land of one's birth, associations, and upbringing, to alien climes. But the present spectacle, whereby countries like China and the Gangetic Delta have a thousand souls per square mile, while Argentina or Patagonia have not even 10, must be rectified, if certain countries are not to be condemned to an eternal destitution simply because of their excess of numbers in proportion to their area or resources, while others are similarly condemned to insufficient development of their available resources merely because of the lack of numbers.

### BY INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

International agreements will be necessary, for the purpose, to modify the Immigration laws, which, in my opinion, blacken the Statute Book of many a *soi-disant* progressive and prosperous country, particularly in the New World. The common tendency, thanks to our education up till now, of the richer communities will, no doubt, be to keep their superior resources primarily for their own use. In so far as such produce of their own resources is needed to maintain the standard of living they have attained, it would be difficult to quarrel with them on the score of justice, economy, or efficiency. But the surplus possibilities of these resources need not be neglected, merely because others who need them are unable to give in exchange any material equivalent. It must, indeed, form an essential part of the post-war reconstruction all over the world that a radical orientation should be brought about in the outlook of every person claiming to be a civilised, social human being, willing to share his all with his fellows, or at least the surplus beyond his own needs.

The employment of force to compel "surplus" countries of today to make them share their resources with their less fortunate brethren in other countries, is futile and fleeting

in its results. Non-violence must be not merely an ideal; it must become an ambition to be turned into an everyday reality. The task is mainly one of re-educating public opinion to the realisation of the common interest of all peoples on the earth in this problem of reconstruction and readjustment of population and resources. It cannot be a matter of dictation by a fiat of the Central authority.

Once this redistribution of manpower adjusted to available resources is effected, the process of development will receive a new impetus, a new inspiration, a new aim. There can and will thereafter be neither surplus nor deficit communities. All will have all they need, and each would be willing to spare the surplus which another may require to make up a temporary shortage, or provide its deficit of some specialised monopoly of its neighbour. Then alone can world collaboration be said to have been established, as envisaged in Article V.

### EXAMPLES OF EXISTING COLLABORATION

This is not unusual or untried even today. Neighbouring communities enter even now into agreements for such purposes. But these are *ad hoc* arrangements lacking integration, correlation, and material sanction. Within the last hundred years or so, the unification of Germany, formerly divided into a number of States, was achieved, first, by bringing about a common Zollverein, next by a loose confederation, and now concretised in the Nazi doctrine of One State, one people, one leader. When the present war threatened a debacle in France, the British Prime Minister offered to merge the separate sovereignties of both countries into one to stem the Nazi flood,—an unmistakable symbol of the trend of events. That offer, or gesture, was destined not to be accepted; perhaps it was not intended to be achieved. Certainly, Mr. Churchill has since asserted in Parliament that he was not the First Minister of the Crown to liquidate the British Empire, even if that Empire is now but a name, a nightmare, or a



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

nemesis. But that precedent is an index, a symptom, or an augury, of the shape of things to come.

In the United States also a considerable agitation is growing for a more or less complete union, fusion, assimilation, with Britain, or the British Commonwealth. The alliance between several nations for carrying on the war more efficiently, the introduction of the Lease and Lend system, the pooling of resources and man-power, the unification of command and strategy, are all sufficient to show that the exigencies of a totalitarian war have tended to make fainter and fainter every day the frontiers of nations.

Even apart from the exigencies of the war, international conventions had been negotiated in regard to such important matters as copyright in literature, patent right in inventions, clearing house for foreign exchanges, postal and radio communication, weights and measures. If, therefore, in addition to the demands of the actual situation, public opinion is still further educated into a truer perception of the common needs of humanity, there is no reason to doubt that this objective could be achieved by consent, and worked up by co-operation.

### INTERIM SAFEGUARDS

Pending this process being constructively put into effect, it is necessary to avoid the undesirable consequence of economic or political inequalities between the various communities making up the world. It will be the task of the world sovereign to see to it that every community, no matter what its own inherent strength, obtains on an equal footing all the material and facilities it needs for the development of its own resources, and advancement of her own culture. The inequalities in the stages of development attained by the several communities today are explained mainly by the inequalities in material resources, or human skill. Even though a given community may be well gifted in some respects, it may be unable to

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

achieve its full degree of development for lack of one or the other ingredient. Such communities become and remain envious and unsatisfied; and so, whenever opportunity offers, they attempt to obtain by aggression what they could not acquire by their own achievements.

If we desire the world sovereign to become acceptable to all, it will have to accept, declare, and assure, and enforce when necessary, certain fundamental rights, not only of every community making part of the World State, but also of every citizen, no matter where he lives and works.

### RIGHTS OF COMMUNITIES

Amongst these primary rights of communities, the most important is that every community should be enabled to achieve the utmost development of its own available resources. Not only should the World Sovereign not become an obstacle to such development; it must, on the contrary, wherever necessary, give every possible assistance and facility to such development. Mention has already been made by way of illustration of such facilities as the redistribution of population adjusted to resources; and of resources or materials in proportion to population. Another similar example may be found in the need of many relatively backward communities for adequate, up-to-date, mechanical equipment, or trained personnel. The World Authority may well be expected to aid in negotiating suitable terms to provide these means. Without this pre-condition, there would not be much universal contentment, nor progress maintained at a reasonable rate all over the world.

If any community has a virtual monopoly of any given commodity, or in excess of its own requirements, it should be persuaded to part with the surplus to others needing it. No country should be free to dissipate its surplus even if unable to use it for itself. The dog-in-the-manger policy must nowhere be tolerated. Rules and

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

conditions may be framed to facilitate agreements for a redistribution of the surplus in one to cure the deficit in another place.

### RECASTING OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE

International commerce, the most fruitful cause of present day misunderstandings, will not disappear because of this re-orientation and remotivation of world economy. But it would be revolutionised in its method, its content, and even in its direction. Commerce will continue between the several countries; but will be so organised that each community will export only its surplus production,—or the production which is its practical monopoly;—and import in exchange materials in which it may be itself comparatively, if not absolutely, lacking. Post-war international trade would not be, besides, for the purpose of securing individual profit; nor in accordance with the individual appreciation of the need for export or import. It would instead have to be conducted by the executive government of each country, in accordance with the basic principles of exchange laid down by the central authority regulating the quantities of imports and exports as between several countries, and their ratios in exchange. All accessories of international commerce, also,—like banking and credit, insurance and transport,—will be purged of the greed for personal profit, and administered as public utilities by the collective authority of each community in collaboration with its customers.

When thus the basis and technique of international commerce are radically recast, many of the present hardships and obstacles will be automatically removed. The element of personal profit must, we repeat, be excluded from commerce, and from the means of communication and transport; it must be replaced by the collective good of each community. The reaction of this new basis of international trade on the productive organisation within each community will be instantaneous. In all articles,

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

whether produced for export or local consumption, the element of private profit must necessarily be eliminated. Production will accordingly and automatically be for use, and not for exchange, primarily. Exchange or commerce will become an incident, not an aim of production. Differences in competitive costs will not be the basis of trade; but they may provide a measure or index of relative needs in the several members of a co-operative community. Even prices would rather be a convenience in reckoning, not an absolute measure of relative values. There will, in fact, be no need to insist upon stability of prices any more than that in foreign exchanges.

## REACTION UPON LOCAL PRODUCTION

And because of this radical change in the origin, nature and function of international commerce, local industry in every community would not need the present day attentions by way of fiscal regulations or hot-house fostering. All the various safeguards, treaties, clearing house arrangements, etc., now-a-days necessary in consequence of the policy of economic nationalism, requiring protection of one's own industry and one's own market, will then be needless, and so discarded.

To secure the utmost possible increase in the aggregate wealth of the world, and, therefore, of each human being, the utmost devotion to the immediate task of the community one may be born or living in, would be considered highly praiseworthy, not only for reasons of efficiency in work, but also of social discipline and solidarity. If any community aims at undermining or frustrating the carrying into effect of any scheme of local development in another, the latter would be entitled to demand the assistance of the Central Authority to prevent or counteract such insidious attempts. In proportion as the new education mentioned above grows, and respect for the world sovereign deepens, such intervention would become more and more unnecessary. The several peoples

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

of the world would begin to realise their own good in the simultaneous advancement of all others. Reason will triumph over selfishness by the very perception of one's interest. If, on the other hand, any given community abuses its right to develop its local resources to the utmost, and so conducts the process as to prove harmful to any other community, the central authority must be entitled to demand assurances against any such unsocial conduct undermining the very foundations of the new world. No one must seek its own immediate good at the expense of its neighbour. Failing adequate and effective assurances on this point, the central authority may even employ force to coerce such an unruly member of the human family.

### LOCAL INDEPENDENCE

Side by side with this right to the fullest possible local development, the independence and integrity of each community must be maintained, as part of the assurances given by the world authority. The independence must be sufficient to enable the community concerned to take all measures for the development of its economic resources and cultural advancement; to maintain personal freedom and ensure social security. India for example, will not only be free from the leading strings of Britain in regard to her fiscal policy. She should be likewise free to make her own just laws regarding the protection of British interests in India, without any dictation of anti-discrimination provisions in her constitution imposed upon her by Britain. The only concern of the central world authority would be to see that by any local development no other community is prejudiced. That authority is, by itself, unable from the nature of the case, to utilise fully the local resources of any of the constituent communities. Nor can it carry out justly and satisfactorily the distribution of the production there raised. It must, accordingly, not be authorised needlessly to intervene in the local administration of each consti-

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

tuent community,—except in vindication of the rights guaranteed to other constituent communities, or to individual citizens. Its main function is to lay down the basic policy, acceptable to all, and make rules to regulate international dealings. The basis accepted by all must be the maintenance of universal peace, and the assurance of security to every individual as well as community, so that the rights guaranteed and assured to all countries and individuals could be duly observed.

### AND INTEGRITY

The problem of maintaining the integrity of each existing country, or any unit as re-formed after the war, and recognised as a constituent part of the World State, is more difficult and complicated, in view of the ever changing conditions and circumstances in the several countries of the world. With suggestions for a dismemberment of India in the air, this problem is of peculiar significance to us in this country at the moment. It will be dealt with later in a more appropriate place. Here it would suffice to add that there is nothing sacrosanct in national frontiers. Premising, as we have done, the freedom of movement of all peoples; and recognising, as we must, the need for a wholesale redistribution of population, we find no difficulty in envisaging a frequent readjustment as between national (sic) boundaries. But these boundaries will have ceased to be barriers. Frontiers must no longer constitute obstruction. The demarcating line between countries must not divide; it must provide the link that binds, the hyphen that joins, different members—separate entities only for convenience—of the same human family.

### RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS

So far, then, we have established as the condition precedent, necessary for the proper reconstruction of the post-war world, that a common World State be created; that, under it, the independent existence and integrity of

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

each community be accepted and assured; and that it should function in accordance with certain ideals of social justice and international harmony that may have been accepted under the leadership of the common, central, sovereign authority. The realisation of these ideals of social justice in daily life will constitute, no doubt, a most complicated problem; not only as between communities, but also as between individual citizens. Methods and devices have already been suggested by which the imperialist or exploitive possibilities, as between communities, may, in course of time, be eliminated. Within each community, on the other hand, vested interests of individuals and the social stratification already established result in mutual exploitation, which will not be ended automatically by those means. If the post-war world is to be a world of security for all individuals and communities, with equal chance of self-realisation and self-fulfilment for each, it is equally important that the possibility of exploitation as between individuals should also be eliminated. For the exploitation of individuals is even more intolerable than that between countries.

### RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS

We have so far considered the guaranteed rights of constituent communities. Let us now turn our attention to the even more important consideration of the fundamental rights of citizens. Personal freedom is regarded today as the foundation and mainspring of the economic system. But, in the co-operative world society we have envisaged, it will have to be carefully regulated. Pure individualism of the classical school, absolutely unrestricted in its pursuit of personal gain, nowhere remains even today untouched. By the biological nature of his being, and the psychological needs of his activity, man is, among all animals, the least able to be independent. He is, in fact, the most dependent. That dependence may be concealed or camouflaged by co-operative social organisation; and its sting taken off by the individual's own

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

consent to subordinate his freedom of thought and action in the interests of effective collective effort. But that does not alter the essence of the question that in civilised society man must needs be a co-operative animal, consciously or unconsciously collaborating with all as the condition precedent and indispensable for his very existence from the cradle to the grave.

## PRESENT-DAY RESTRICTIONS OF PERSONAL FREEDOM

The exigencies of the war have compelled every community, directly engaged in fighting, to place innumerable restrictions on the individual's freedom to choose his work or bargain for his wage. After this experience, absolute insistence on undiluted personal freedom can scarcely figure as the basis and *sine qua non* of social reorganisation after the war. Every liberty loving community bases, no doubt, its social organisation on the assumption that every citizen must enjoy a certain measure of personal freedom. But wherever any act of the individual has a reaction upon others of his fellow citizens, or upon society; or wherever an individual activity can be taken in hand only with the co-operation of the community, inspired by the community, for the benefit of the community, personal freedom must necessarily be restricted in the interest of the common good. Discipline and co-ordination are the indispensable pre-requisites of successful co-operation; self-control the unavoidable price of living in civilised society. On such foundations alone can we build a social system,—compact, coherent, carefully co-ordinated in all its parts and activities. The one lesson the war has forced upon us is the realisation that personal freedom is not individual license; that national independence does not mean national exclusiveness. Civilised society is not a jungle, where humanity functions on the level of beasts of prey, where might alone is right. The instinct of the savage must yield to the discipline of co-operative effort for the common good.



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

This does not mean that no individual would have the freedom in future to realise the purpose of his own being. On the contrary, the very discipline and co-ordination, postulated above, will facilitate and expedite its fuller realisation by every individual. At the same time, just as, *vis-a-vis* the world sovereign authority, every constituent community will have certain fundamental rights guaranteed, so, too, in relation to the governing authority of every country, and as between its individual citizens, certain fundamental rights of individuals will be guaranteed and assured. If so deemed proper, these rights may be endorsed, so to say, by the common sovereign state, and enforced or observed by the local governing authority.

Chief amongst these fundamental rights of citizenship are :—

(a) **Freedom of thought, speech and writing; association and movement.**—This is now-a-days accepted almost as axiomatic. But the right is not absolute or unconditional. It must not be so exercised as to conflict with any corresponding right of another; nor offend his sentiment, or obstruct his work. Such offence would lead to a breach of local peace, which must be avoided in every civilised government. The necessary restrictions will, therefore, be imposed or implied by such means as libel laws.

Freedom of association to attain any purpose common to the associates is similarly conditioned, tacitly if not expressly, by the proviso that any such groups or associations will not function so as to subvert the basis of society accepted at any time. Every one will, of course, have full freedom to criticise the existing basis of society, or the working of the social system at any given moment. But that right must not be perverted and abused to create or emphasise class antagonisms, which it is the primary objective of post-war reconstruction to eliminate altogether.

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

On the other hand, it may become an integral part of the reconstructed world to insist, for purpose of facility in administering social legislation, that workers in every category must form themselves into trade unions, or professional organisations. In the new world, every adult shall be a worker, and none an idler or parasite. No one should be free to keep away from such professional associations of workers amongst themselves; no privilege, benefit, or special treatment, assured or allowed to workers by law or in practice, will be available, except through these organisations.

Finally, the right of free movement from habitat to habitat, or occupation to occupation, is also subject to the requirements of the tasks before the community. Just as in modern war, there is no evading of military duties, so in the reconstructed post-war world, there must be no evading of social conscription. Given, however, very large numbers of workers in every community, this conscription can easily be made to operate with the minimum of restrictions and maximum of choice to the individual regarding the place as well as the kind of work he does. Traveling for pleasure, sight-seeing and self-improvement would be restricted or conditioned, if at all, by the demands of the tasks before the community, and the regulations regarding leave or vacations.

### FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

(b) As a corollary of the foregoing, and intimately connected with it, is the freedom of religious observance and belief. The administration of the State must necessarily be exclusively and entirely secular.

But for the individual it would be part of the freedom of thought and expression already premised. Apart altogether from the governmental organisation, such a freedom may, accordingly, be recognised as one of the fundamental rights. It is, however, not intended by such recognition to encourage religious fanaticism or intolerance. Regulations, if not restrictions, must, therefore, be

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

imposed in practice over the exercise of this right, so that the equal rights of others professing different religions, or no religion, may not be prejudiced.

### FREEDOM FROM WANT

(c) The right, however, apparently mentioned also in the Atlantic Charter,\* to safeguard every individual against lack or starvation, is not, even in the most progressive communities, so freely and fully accepted as those mentioned hitherto. A very large section of the community, in every individualist country, is still exposed to the risk, often a reality, of sheer starvation. Even in a country like the United States, 10 or 12 years ago, when the Depression was at its highest, the unemployed numbered 12 millions out of an adult or working population of 60 millions. In Britain some relief, scanty and degrading as it was, was available by way of dole. But in the United States, until the New Deal came into operation, even that was a matter of private charity, in which the State was wholly unconcerned.

This is a situation utterly discreditable to any state which calls itself civilised. In countries like India and China, where famines, epidemics, and other such pests are a matter of frequent occurrence, the spectacle of death by the million through sheer starvation is so common, that people in those parts have become callous and indifferent. We hardly realise that these are matters that can be easily rectified by human effort and organisation. It must, therefore, be one of the first conditions of the reconstructed world, and every constituent unit of it, that every individual, willing and able to work, shall obtain work suitable to his or her physical and mental ability, aptitude, and training. It must be made a collective obligation of the community to find work for the individual, just as it must be the duty of the individual to do the work assigned to him. No one shall starve; but none should be idle and unemployed who could contribute

---

\* cp. Article V.

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

his mite to the common stock in any form suited to his training or capacity.

### SOCIAL SECURITY

(d) Following the same principle, in so far as human ingenuity and modern science can provide, every arrangement must be made to **secure individuals** against all those contingencies of human life and work which are collectively described as **insecurity**. Adequate insurance must be provided against illness, old age, accident, maternity, bodily or mental disability or defect. Such insurance must include medical treatment and nursing.

### CIVIC EQUALITY

(e) It is an ancient maxim that merit alone deserves respect; neither sex nor age. The maxim must form the cornerstone in conducting the public life and social activity in the post-war world. No individual could be debarred from the pursuit or exercise of any occupation, calling, or profession,—none should be excluded from holding any post, or discharging any function, merely on the ground of birth, sex, or religion.

This equality of all citizens seems to be accepted, at least in name, in the progressive states even of today. No doubt, all individuals are not absolutely equal in all respects, particularly in regard to bodily fitness, intellectual capacity, objective training, or practical experience. Even in the reconstructed world, in proportion as these individual differences endure, there should be difference in their working capacity. Recognising the principle, however, and permitting difference in occupation according to the different capacity, training, or aptitude, arrangements must nevertheless be made to prevent such differences operating so as to give birth to a new social stratification, whereby one group of workers may be more privileged than others, and in a position to exploit them. Too many precautions cannot be taken against this danger.

(f) & (g) There may be other similar rights, but these

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

will suffice as illustrations. Rights like those to a standard minimum of education and cultural enlightenment at public expense; or to certain other similar social services will have to be guaranteed by each community to its own immediate members.

### CORRESPONDING OBLIGATIONS

While declaring and assuring such fundamental rights of individuals as well as of communities collectively, certain obligations, corresponding to the rights assured, will have to be imposed and enforced, both upon communities collectively and upon individual citizens.

#### OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Of these obligations, the most important are :—

A. (i) Every individual must maintain and cultivate towards all other individuals having the same world citizenship, friendly sentiments, which must include full **tolerance** for difference in views. The greatest enemy today to the solidarity of mankind and its collective progress is the inherent intolerance as between individuals, as well as between communities. There seems to be a general tendency to hold that what we think is the only true thing; what we do is the only useful or beneficial activity; and, consequently, the conduct, belief, or behaviour of all others, not in accord with ours, must be treated with intolerance. Such intolerance is worse than envy and competitive individualist greed.

#### RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE

But even in this sense of intolerance, the greatest offender is religion. More wars have been caused by religious intolerance than any other single factor. Religion, however, has become so deeply rooted, as one of the props of the existing social order, that it would be impossible to attempt its dis-establishment,—except, perhaps, by a revolutionary government, feeling itself strong enough and securely established. All that the slow process

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

of silent evolution might attempt in this field is to transform the state into a completely secular organisation, leaving religion severely alone. Contempt and indifference would kill religion much more thoroughly than the wildest persecution.

### RACIAL EXCLUSIVENESS

Next to religion, the most important type of intolerance is a sense of class, caste, or race superiority. The carefully cultivated belief that a given community is the chosen one, specially appointed by some super-natural authority to lord it over the destinies of mankind, is at the root of the Nazi aggressiveness. But the feeling is noticeable, in one form or another, in imperialist nations of all times and of all countries. The treatment of the indigenous population in America, Africa, or even Asia, by European conquerors, settlers, or traders will fully bear comparison with the lot of the Jews in Germany today. The Herrenvolk have always felt and maintained their brahminhood in all ages and in every country. It must, however, be scotched relentlessly, so that no tacit denial of the fundamental equality as between citizens of World State should ever arise.

### REORGANISE EDUCATION

The most important means to remedy this sense of intolerance, exclusiveness, and inequality, is reorganisation in the system, method and ideals of public education. It is, indeed, the teacher and the preacher, the author and the editor, who inculcate and keep this feeling of superiority in a given class or community, as contradistinguished from another. Unless education proceeds on a more rational, human basis, this evil would be impossible to eradicate.

### ECONOMIC EQUALITY

(ii) Just as it is necessary to eliminate from the prevailing mentality the sense of intolerance on the cultural

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

plane, so also it is necessary to create and foster a feeling of economic equality. **The idle unemployed, who consider it their birthright to fatten on the sweat of others, must be categorically abolished, without mercy, without exception, without apology.** The rentier and the profiteer must be branded as a parasite, hunted as vermin, and rooted out wherever the pest is found. Social conscription for all able-bodied adults, irrespective of sex, must be premised as the *sine qua non* of existence, though work may be assigned to each in accordance with his physical and mental capacity, training, and aptitude. The important thing is not the choice of occupation; it is the principle that none shall share in the national dividend who contribute nothing *pro-rata* towards it.

It may be that on account of some physical disability, temporary invalidity, or old age, a person may be incapacitated from working, either temporarily or permanently. Such persons may be maintained, even though they do not contribute to the national wealth, at least for the time being. If a comprehensive plan is prepared in each community, and the work of the community is carefully distributed in accordance with the plan, only an extremely small proportion of the population would have to be excused from any work, and yet maintained in a prescribed standard of life. The share the aged are allowed in the national dividend is a sort of deferred wage, not paid to them while they were at work in the fullness of their mental and physical capacity. It is the basis, ethical as well as economic, of all claims to superannuation pension. The same may be said, also, with regard to the treatment and maintenance during temporary illness, accident, or disability, as being the amount due to them as insurance benefit paid out of their own accumulated contributions.

Incidentally, I would add that no system of social insurance will be sane or healthy which is not contributory. There must be no element in it of charity, which is the

## PRE-REQUISITES OF REORGANISATION

outcome of exploitation of one individual by another. By these means, social parasitism, pure and simple, such as now flourishes as an honoured class in all capitalist countries, founded on private property and inherited wealth, will be effectively abolished.

Oblige everyone to work, teach everyone to be tolerant; and peace and harmony between individuals within a community, as well as internationally, would be assured. The duty of co-operation will be but a natural outlet, a spontaneous urge of every sane individual to accomplish the purpose of his being as well as the ideals accepted by society. The education system, while negatively undermining intolerance and inequality, must positively inculcate the need as well as the benefit of co-operation, as a mere consequence of human limitations.

## COLLECTIVE OBLIGATIONS

B. Amongst the obligations of every constituent community we must emphasise particularly the following:

### MAKE COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL PLAN

(i) The local government in every community should consider it as its foremost duty to achieve the utmost possible development of its own resources. For that purpose, it must prepare a scientific, comprehensive plan and programme of development, co-ordinating all activities of its people. Such a local plan, needless to add, can be easily integrated with a world plan. In realising such a Plan, every individual will necessarily be required to co-operate, and contribute to the utmost of his or her physical or mental capacity, training and aptitude. Subject to this contribution, the rest of the individual's life may be left the fullest freedom, or scope for self-expression and self-development. The actual execution and the administration of the planned programme in each locality should be entrusted to the local government of that region.



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

### OBLIGATIONS TO MINORITIES

(ii) Wherever, for any reason there are inextinguishable minorities, which apprehend their rights as individuals as liable to be ignored, infringed upon, or minimised, there, in order to remove the doubts, distrust, or misgivings of such minorities, and to secure local solidarity and effective co-operation between the various sections of the community, it may be necessary for the World Sovereign to guarantee such rights and undertake to see them duly observed in practice.

\* \* \* \* \*

This discussion of rights and obligations has necessarily to be superficial. There is no room here to go deeper into the matter. But even these broad outlines would suffice to show that if we desire to make these radical changes, accepted by all and common to all; if we desire to sow their seeds very deep, and make their fruits abiding and perennial, it is essential that they should be all clearly laid down, and accepted by all. With the combined guarantee and assurances from the central authority, as well as the governing authority of each community, there can be no great difficulty in their due observance or enforcement.

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

Before sketching, in broad outline, the world thus reconstructed, let us take note of the task this reconstructed world is designed to accomplish. The war has wrought immense damage in the regions directly affected by hostilities. Immense numbers of men have died, or been maimed; houses have been wiped out, factories destroyed, transport and communications damaged. This destruction must be made good, as the first task of the reconstructed world. Apart from the human factor,—the loss or damage to which may be irreplaceable,—a wholesale programme of rehabilitation and replacement must be undertaken all over the world, if the hope of permanent peace is not to be a mere delusion. Men as skilled workers, money as capital, and materials must be provided to tackle this task of gigantic rehabilitation.

Side by side with this task of rehabilitation in regions wasted by the war, the overdue claims of backward, or undeveloped regions must also be attended to. The resources of the whole world must be tapped, developed, exploited to the utmost, to increase the aggregate of the world's wealth; and improve all-round the standard of living. An irreducible minimum of necessities as well as amenities of civilised life must be guaranteed for all, and made available to each.

### OUTLINE PICTURE OF THE WORLD RECONSTRUCTED

What would this reconstructed world look like? There will, of course, be the innovation of a common world authority, charged with certain duties, and entrusted with certain powers. These functions and powers must be

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

exercised for the common good, and in accordance with certain commonly accepted ideals.

Under this new world sovereign, there will be a number of independent communities, organised as distinct, integral entities, which must, however, mutually co-operate in all matters of common interest. Their area and population will have to be readjusted, with full freedom of movement to all people in all parts of the world. National boundaries will not be so many barriers; they will only be landmarks. And, of course, there will be a common world citizenship. Subject to this, the independence and integrity of every constituent unit must be maintained.

The size and strength, the area and population, of these constituent units of the world federation will be a matter of adjustment, from time to time, by common consent. A certain optimum standard of area and population will have to be laid down, which may serve as a gauge, not act as a bar. Readjustment may be both by way of dismemberment of an existing unit into separate units, or fresh combination and reintegration of existing units to suit changing conditions or circumstances. These changes, however, cannot affect the rights of citizenship and the allegiance of individuals.

If the principle of democracy, and the practice of real self-government grow, chances are that the average unit will tend to be smaller. In large conglomerates, not only is a working democracy impossible; there is far more obstruction to an effective prosecution of a coherent plan of all-round development, because of the likelihood of divergent interests developing. There must, of course, be a floor; and there will probably, be also a ceiling, to the area and population deemed suitable for political as well as economic reasons of a working democracy and intensive development of local resources.

As for individuals, all will have certain guaranteed rights and consequential obligations in a common world

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

citizenship, which will gradually transform society and all social relations.

With the reduced productive capacity and resources, the world after the war would have to meet and satisfy increased wants. In proportion as the productive organisation has suffered, factories destroyed, land damaged, machinery sabotaged, means of communication and transport ruined, and even the labour of man affected, in that proportion the wants of mankind would not have *diminished*, but increased. It may be that millions of mankind will lose their lives in actual warfare. But those who have been wounded or disabled would suffer far more than those who have actually lost their lives, and have ceased to affect the demand side of the economic equation. Moreover those who have lost their lives were, comparatively, in the bloom of manhood; while those who have survived must be either aged or crippled, and so less capable of producing to the utmost capacity. Their wants would be different; but, in volume and weight, greater than when they were in the bloom of life. The mechanical equipment and other sources of production, as well as means of transport, would remain in deficit for a long time after the war, thanks to the destruction brought about by it.

## SCRAP MONEY ECONOMY

With the individual selfishness as the main economic motive being eliminated, the foundation stone of reconstruction would be well and truly laid. The next big change would be in the means of measuring the achievement. This is at present done purely by money. All goods and services are valued only in money. But this way of measuring and expressing relative values is dangerous and misleading. It has resulted in a complete perversion of all real values. In the reconstructed world, we will, therefore, have to recast radically the place and function, the nature and substance, of money.

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

The inherent qualities of commodities or services to be exchanged must have full weight in valuation, and not merely the relative excess or scarcity of any commodity or service in a given market at a given moment. The aggregate need of the community pursuing a planned programme of development may also have a say in determining the exchange ratio between given commodities at a given moment. International trade will be a collective barter; and local trade completely regulated by the planning authority, which must fix in every case the relative exchange rates or prices, even though expressed in a common medium.

Even if the present way of measuring relative values of prices in terms of money as applied to lifeless articles has in any degree to be maintained, it is impossible to accept it as regards human labour and human relations. Because goods and services are all measured in money, today, the importance of money has increased enormously. Money was merely a tool of commerce in the beginning of economic society. But, in course of time, it has become the presiding deity of the entire economic world, regulating all movements, and permeating all relations.

Money, as a medium of exchange, will have to be retained; but money as the sole measure of value must be dethroned. As a tool of commerce, it is indispensable; but as a dominating, dictating factor in public or private economy, it is intolerable. As a vehicle for transferring values, it is necessary; but as an indelible, unvarying, indefeasible standard of all values, it is preposterous. And, much more, as a convenient store of abiding value, it is a menace which must be rejected and discarded as an abomination.

### COLLECTIVE ACTION NECESSARY

Transformation of money, and reconstructing the basis for estimating and regulating relative values, is not possible by the unilateral action of the community alone. A single community may be able to do something in this

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

regard, as a temporary remedy for its own use. Many such experiments have in fact been made, by which particular communities have recast their monetary systems, so as to tide over passing emergencies. But these local experiments were essentially of a temporary character. Their authors had seldom abandoned all hope of reverting to the universal worship of the golden calf.

But for our purposes the very ideal of money economy requires to be recast. All communities must, therefore, combine to change the nature and function of money, by common agreement and for permanent use. The World State must take the lead, and evolve a medium of exchange and measure of relative value, founded on some real, intrinsic utility, and expressed in some definite, understandable quantity. It is essential and imperative that this new medium should be open to variation and readjustment by the same authority and the same machinery as first evolved it. It may, and, in course of time, should, evolve into a common world currency.

Gold and silver have served this purpose for centuries. But they are no longer efficient instruments, nor evenly distributed, and uniformly regulated. We must devise a substitute, capable of adjusting itself easily to the changing conditions of production and consumption of myriads of commodities and services. The commodity or service of the commonest use may well serve to supply this requisite of modern world economy. The attention of experts may be directed to the possibility of evolving a standard unit of measurement based upon an hour of labour working under normal conditions and standard equipment.

### BASIC IDEALS OF RECONSTRUCTION

At the risk of some repetition, let us restate here the ideals, or principles, on which the world reconstruction, envisaged here, is to be based:

- (i) The method of violence to settle international differences must be abandoned by all. War must be finally, and for ever, abolished from the face of the earth.

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

This abolition will not be achieved so long as the root causes of wars, so far experienced continue. The axe must, accordingly, be applied to these root causes of all wars, before we can hope for a truly warless world to emerge.

- (ii) With the abolition and outlawry of war by the willing consent of civilised mankind, some adequate and effective machinery must be evolved to settle international differences. Compulsory arbitration of all such disputes, without exception, must become the universal rule.

- (iii) A world organisation, appropriately armed and authorised, must be set up to enforce this rule.

The armed forces of all communities must be entrusted to this authority exclusively, which must also conduct and manage all armament industries, and munitions-making.

A police force, sufficient to maintain local order, should be left in charge of each component unit.

- (iv) The institution of such a World Sovereign authority will suffice to put an end to all forms of political and economic imperialism, characteristic of the last century and a half. With imperialist domination or exploitation abolished, the present-day conflict between the haves and the have-nots will find no room.

- (v) National independence, equality, and integrity must be assured to all communities forming part of the World State, subject to such reservation as is necessitated by the equally important right of each such community to form new combinations, or dissolve existing ones, by the free consent of the parties concerned.

- (vi) These equal members of the World Federation must have equal access to all essential raw materials, no matter where they may be found. The terms of exchange of such materials must be collectively negotiated and agreed upon, so as to secure the utmost advantage to all parties concerned.

- (vii) National independence, assured to every constituent unit of the World Federation, must not

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

be exercised, so as to prejudice the equal rights of other members premised in the preceding. The intense Economic Nationalism, characteristic of the last generation, must be ended; and the forces giving it birth must be eliminated for ever.

- (viii) Every independent community is entitled to develop to the utmost its own local resources and opportunities.

This development, however, must not be so conducted as to prejudice the similar right of any other community, nor lead to any form of economic aggression, imperialism, or exploitation, as between a community more developed and another less so.

- (ix) Every independent community should develop its local resources in accordance with a pre-determined Plan. This Plan must be integrated and co-ordinated with the corresponding plans in all other sister communities, so as to bring about an equal and simultaneous development on all fronts in all countries, and thereby add materially to the aggregate wealth of the world.

- (x) The wealth thus increased must be distributed everywhere in accordance with the dictates of social justice, so as to eliminate any chance of want, or fear of destitution.

This distribution must provide adequate security against the common contingencies of human life and work. It must assure to every individual an irreducible minimum of the necessities, comforts, and amenities of civilised existence.

- (xi) To facilitate the utmost development of all resources, and a just distribution of the increased wealth of the world, a common world citizenship should be evolved, based upon freedom of movement and settlement to everybody on equal terms.
- (xii) Subject to the demands of a planned programme of development, individual freedom of thought, expression, association, and movement must be guaranteed to all. The right to work must also



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

be an obligation, exerciseable and enforceable everywhere,—the work being appropriate to the mental and physical capacity, training, or aptitude of each individual. Parasitism must be rigorously prohibited.

- (xiii) Freedom of religious profession and worship, as well as of association, may be included among the Fundamental Rights of Citizenship, provided that such rights are exercised without prejudice to the similar rights of others. The State must, in no case, have any connection with organised religion of any kind.
- (xiv) In the reconstructed world, the competitive principle must be replaced by the co-operative. To achieve this, the present-day motive of personal profit must be substituted by the desire to secure the common good by collective effort. —[This is a matter for a change in fundamental outlook, which will be the task of the New Education to bring about.]
- (xv) Money economy,—the cash nexus,—must be scrapped. Production for use should be substituted, as much as possible, for production for exchange. Trade must be a consequence of regional surplus or speciality, rather than of differences in comparative costs, reckoned in money.

### WORKING PICTURE

Let us now consider the actual appearance and working of this reconstructed world.

(1) After the present war, the basis and objective, the aims and ideals, of reconstruction, applied to the whole world, will have been laid down categorically and authoritatively and accepted by all.

(2) A World Sovereign authority will be established, by the consent of all, and entrusted with all the means of warfare—armaments and munitions—as the custodian of all these instruments.

Its principal functions must be

- (a) to maintain peace all over the world;
- (b) to prevent aggression and war;

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

- (c) to declare and guarantee the fundamental rights of the communities collectively as well as of individuals, including their security;
- (d) to provide machinery (e.g., arbitration) so that automatic solution be afforded for any disputes as between communities; and
- (e) to assure that the obligations of individuals as well as communities, consequent upon their guaranteed rights, will be duly, truly, fully observed and enforced.

(3) The problem of constituting this new authority is not for us to solve. We need only add that it must be founded by the consent and worked with the co-operation, of all. The principle of representative legislature and responsible executive may be advantageously incorporated in this constitution. It must, however, never be forgotten that no discrimination must appear to have been made as between the smaller or larger, richer or poorer, communities, on pain of forfeiting the confidence of its constituents.

(4) Subject to guaranteed rights of individuals and communities, and consistent with the functions specifically entrusted to the central authority, the fullest freedom must be left to the local governments of the constituent units to frame and work their own constitution, and administer each its own plan of development.

(5) The different countries and peoples of the world will continue more or less as they exist today. Each one of them will be regarded as an independent entity by itself. The variety of culture and resources of these different peoples will also continue. The steady and simultaneous progress and development of each will be a guarantee of the progress of the world as a whole.

(6) For international intercourse and commerce, the various constituent units, no matter what their area, population or riches, must be regarded as equal members of a common zollverein, subject to the right of each to develop their own resources to supply their own needs, the central authority aiding and abetting them in the task.

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

(7) Notwithstanding the distinct and independent existence of each unit, there must be mutual co-operation for common good, under the guidance of the central, and with the consent of the constituent, authority.

(8) Given this reorganisation, the present-day international jealousies due to economic greed will have no place. With the disappearance of international rivalries and competition, international commerce will not come to an end. Such commerce, however, will be collectivised, and not left as a matter of personal greed or exclusive profit. The exports will, normally, consist of surplus or speciality of given regions; and imports to cover their local deficits.

(9) In the commercial intercourse of the new world no room should be left to any exploitive tendency. This is to ensure that the whole benefit of the local development of resources should not be exclusively reserved for the people of that locality or country. Everyone is a partner in the benefit or achievement of each. If in any particular locality or country, due to any natural or human circumstances, there is a monopoly, the local population should not be entitled to have an exclusive possession or use of that special product of that country. Much less is it entitled to keep out all other peoples from any share in such product. Local independence and autonomy must consequently not be interpreted in such manner as to give rise to acute differences leading to war.

(10) Every community must and shall have full scope to accomplish its own local prosperity by developing its own local resources in accordance with its own plan. This must be the foundation of the new world order. If any community is lacking in means or resources, scientific knowledge or practical experience, the deficit or lack must be made good by or through the central authority, or voluntary arrangements with neighbours better situated than themselves.

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

(11) With the growth of material prosperity, the desire for cultural advancement will inevitably increase. Cultural intercourse as between people would, therefore, not only continue, but will steadily increase.

(12) A redistribution of population in the different parts of the world will be made with common consent of all mankind. There is today varying pressure of population upon the soil in the several countries. There are countries, like Belgium, Britain or China, having over 500 persons per square mile; while there are others in Africa, America and Australia, where the density is less than 10 per square mile. This enormous disparity between available or obtainable resources and the human labour to develop them inevitably results in keeping the world poorer than it need be. A substantial redistribution of the population of the world, so as to make it commensurate with the resources to be developed, and appropriate to the climatic and other natural conditions, must be effected under the guidance of the world authority, and by agreement amongst the parties concerned. The problem, we may add, is not insoluble, given our present means of transport and technical equipment for developing resources.

In the last generation or two, the ideal of local exclusiveness has, in certain countries, been so enforced, that, no matter what the amount of their resources yet awaiting development, they have tried to reserve for themselves exclusively the land and materials available within their own boundaries. A series of special legislation restricting or denying immigration has followed. Even in the United States of America, apart from their immigration laws, Asiatics have hitherto been precluded from acquiring full citizenship rights, or landed property in full ownership. And that in addition to the prevailing prejudices on grounds of race, colour, or creed !

If the sentiment of a common world citizenship is ever to be born and fostered, it is of the utmost importance that the central world authority take upon itself, by every

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

peaceful means at its disposal, to bring about, in the next generation at least, a reasonable redistribution of the population of the different countries, so as to transplant the excess of some to make up the insufficiency of others.

Such excess or insufficiency must be considered, not only in absolute quantities, but also with reference to the resources and opportunities to be developed.

(13) Certain Fundamental Rights of the individual will be declared, assured, and guaranteed by the central as well as the local authority. The obligations corresponding must be similarly declared, emphasised, and enforced.

(14) A real revolution would then be accomplished. The different countries with their different population would continue; but the freedom of movement thus facilitated on a world wide scale would bring about full realisation of the ideal of all mankind being one family. The whole world will be a common motherland of living beings; and the differences of birth, caste, creed, or complexion would become little more than historical memories.

(15) With the establishment of a central authority, the sovereignty of each constituent unit, as accepted today, must be radically restricted. The virtue of local patriotism would become superfluous. Just as even today local loyalty of each citizen to the state of his birth in the United States is rapidly yielding place to the common loyalty towards the Union; just as in this country the local loyalty to each province or state is yielding place to the ideal of a common Indian nationalism, so, too, it is only one step forward to transmute the existing national loyalty into the ideal of world citizenship, and mutual loyalty in all mankind. Without this, universal co-operation will for ever remain a dream.

(16) Given social, political, and economic equality in a common world citizenship, it would be impossible for any single community or country to regard itself in any way as superior to any other. Race pride can have no place in

## THE WORLD REORGANISED

the reconstructed world of abiding peace and universal co-operation. Differences of birth, race, caste or complexion have, no doubt, coloured our past; but they have everywhere been proved to be unfounded in fact, and unnecessary for progress.

(17) Religion has made perhaps the largest contribution in introducing and maintaining these distinctions among mankind. It has also evolved the deepest intolerance. A high place has, no doubt, been given, with every guarantee, to personal freedom of thought and belief, which is taken to include freedom of religious belief and worship. We would not, however, allow such guaranteed freedom to mean that any established church should anywhere monopolise authority, and encourage that degree of religious fanaticism which would be fundamentally incompatible with a rational egalitarian society. It must be among the foremost duties of every local government to maintain civic equality and mutual toleration in all the local inhabitants. Toleration and attempts at conversion from one religion to another are mutually incompatible. We may admit it as a right of every individual of age to choose for himself the religious belief or observance he wants to follow. But that is a purely personal choice of the individual, and should have no social reaction.

(18) Education will be recast in method as well as content. Discarding many a hoary idol of the market place, it must cultivate an outlook in the teacher, as well as the taught, which would be consonant in every way with the new society herein contemplated.

(19) In order that the fullest possible local development is achieved, every constituent community should, as far as possible, be composed of mutually harmonious elements. The economic stratification of society hitherto prevailing had inherent antagonism as between classes. Even if we do, as we must, eliminate these economic inequalities, we would not automatically exclude all other disuniting elements. But even if these differences persist,

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

care must be taken that they do not become obstructive to the collective good.

(20) These are but the bare outlines of the new reconstructed world. I believe, however, that it is the only workable way out of our present difficulties.

## VI INDIA UNDER RECONSTRUCTION

What will be the place of India in this reconstructed world? Certain basic principles or rights outlined above must necessarily apply to her as to other countries. That is to say:

(1) The right to formulate her own constitution, and choose the government under which her people would like to live, (Article III) must be accorded to India as much as to any other country. India must be completely independent of any outside power, authority, or influence. (See 10 below.)

(2) This independent India must rank in perfect equality with other similar units. No discrimination must be made against her regarding her representation and influence in the several authorities of the World State—executive, legislative, or judicial. No invidious demands, like extra territoriality of particular nations, should be made of her, nor special safeguards demanded for any non-Indians.

(3) Not only should she have this independence as a matter of right; she should also be assured complete freedom from any exploitation or domination, direct or indirect, by any other outside power. Whatever limitations are placed upon the independence, or local sovereignty, of any constituent of the World State, *e.g.* surrendering the right to maintain her own armed forces or armament factories, would, of course, be accepted by this country. But that acceptance must be with her free consent as by any other country.

(4) Subject to this, such guarantees as are required of and accepted by any constituent unit, regarding the rights of non-nationals of one country settled in another—like Britishers in India—will be given by India. These guarantees,



## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

needless to add, will also be in accordance with the general policy of a common world citizenship accepted or laid down by common consent under the world authority.

(5) So far as any outside power is concerned, the integrity of this country must be solemnly guaranteed and assured. If any change or readjustment has to be made, it can and must be the sole concern of the people of India only. Observations have already been offered on the extent to which such integrity can or should be a matter of combined guarantee. If the principle of self-determination by any region and the people living in that region is accepted, and at the same time, it is also agreed that inter-unit differences of any kind shall be settled by mutual persuasion, conciliation, or arbitration, but never by force, it may be that centrifugal forces may prevail, and the integrity of India, as we know it today, may be affected.

Economic factors, on the other hand, may quite possibly induce the realisation that, between the several parts of this country, there is a much greater and more fundamental unity and harmony, and necessity of concentrated co-operation for all-round development, than for any part of that country with any neighbouring country; and so may arrest these forces of disintegration. It will not do, however, to adopt a merely non-possumus attitude, or refuse to consider the very idea of any separation of any constituent parts of the country from other parts. Such refusal would be apt only to induce a corresponding inflexibility in the advocates of secession.

(6) The right both to dismember existing units into more convenient separate entities, if the people comprising this union so desire; or, alternatively, the right for existing separate entities to combine into a larger unit, if the people of the entities find it more economical to organise such a combination, must be equally recognised. This combination may be for limited, specified purposes; or for all the aims and objectives of a single state. These two principles may apply simultaneously; so that it should be equally

## INDIA UNDER RECONSTRUCTION

possible for certain parts of the country to separate and form a new state of their own; as for other state, *e.g.*, Ceylon or Nepal, now existing as independent units, to coalesce.

(7) In any event, any such act must be by the consent of the people concerned—in seceding, as well as in coalescing. In the former case, some stipulation should be made as to the proportion of people, in the areas desiring to secede, whose votes may validly decide upon such dismemberment. A bare majority should not be allowed to break up an existing entity, particularly as any plebiscite for breaking up is bound to create a volume of ill-feeling that is undesirable in the interest of the unit as a whole as well as its separating parts. If, however, any considerable majority, say, two-thirds or three-fourths, of the adult population in the regions concerned desire to secede, and form a new entity by themselves, no power on earth can prevent them from doing so. In the latter case of a new union, such majorities should consent to the fusion in both entities.

It is desirable that some definite criteria be agreed to and laid down for carrying out either process. A minimum of number as well as a prescribed extent of territory should also be agreed to and prescribed as indispensable for such decisions. The use of force in any case is futile in seeking to maintain a unity with such a considerable proportion of the people concerned opposed.

(8) Assuming that any such dismemberment becomes inevitable, it need, however, not follow, as a matter of course, that the separate parts of the same pre-existing unit must be antagonistic towards each other. Arrangements can and should be made by which, though for purposes of day to day administration they are separate, they may nevertheless form a combine or alliance between themselves for all matters of common concern; and so avoid any interruption of the process of local development which may otherwise happen. The only difference will be that two equally independent authorities will function in place of the present

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

single Central Government of India; but these two governments agree to co-operate on certain pre-determined lines and for the common purpose of all-round development.

The loss of a common authority would be no great cause for alarm, inasmuch as we have premised the institution of a World State wherein the central authority will be common for all units, and not for any two or three units only.

(9) It is assumed that the seceding units—or provinces—of India will themselves combine into a federation of their own. It would needlessly handicap any single unit, if it insists upon secession, and then to stand alone by itself. There must be federation on either side of the dividing line.

It is possible, however, [see (13) below] that, if secessionist forces prevail, the India of to-day may split up into more than two units, without reckoning the constituent states and provinces in each. The principle of the largest measure of local autonomy, side by side with federation of contiguous and mutually harmonious or sympathetic units, may, nevertheless, be applied to these several units also. It will be found to be, in the aggregate and the long run, the most suitable and satisfactory.

(10) The minorities in these two federal states must be adequately and effectively safeguarded. If necessary, the guarantee of the World State may be added to make these safeguards real and trustworthy. No room must be left, as far as possible, for such minorities in either part to insist upon further disintegration of the unit.

(11) The Indian States are a case apart. In all probability, however, they will have to fall in with their and adjoining federation; and be assimilated in life and work to the conditions prevailing in the neighbouring areas. They cannot be suffered to continue as independent units.

(12) Whatever the future political organisation of this country—whether a single entity, as it now is, or any other

## INDIA UNDER RECONSTRUCTION

form as may be agreed upon by its people hereafter,—this much is certain, that, for purposes of real, working, democracy, or actual self-government, the unit of self-government would have to be necessarily much smaller than perhaps even the larger provinces of today provide. For purposes of enabling each region, fairly homogeneous in population, material resources, and economic characteristics, to realise its own purpose and develop its own resources; as also for convenience in administration, any local entity must be vested with much larger powers of autonomy in local concerns than is the case with the existing component parts of this country. As in existing federations so in the world federation, it is best in the beginning to respect local sentiment and allow it full scope. It must be the task of the new education to implant and foster a real sentiment of mutual loyalty all over the world, which will, in good time, take the place of the present day local patriotism. It is unnecessary and undesirable to appear to force this growth.

(13) The details of this organisation must needs be left to a Constituent Assembly, or any other similar device, which will represent the people, and carry out their wishes regarding the form of government they want to live under.

In the event of the present agitation, in some quarters, for the separation of certain areas from the existing unit called India succeeding, there will have to be an agreement sanctioning such a secession, or separation. The same Constituent Assembly may not be competent, in that eventuality, to prepare a constitution of either unit. But even if the constitution of either part is framed by a distinct Constituent Assembly,—or any other similar machinery,—the constitution must, in either case, provide :

- (a) adequate and effective guarantees for the Minorities in each, endorsed, if necessary, by the guarantee of the World Sovereign authority;
- (b) a basis for some working agreement, even after separation, to manage conjointly the common concerns of both parts, e.g., posts, telegraphs

## POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

or telephones; railways, roads and rivers; currency and credit; and the lake;

- (c) democratic forms, methods and institutions of government, as calculated best to minimise the apprehensions of Minorities, and permit political parties being formed on material instead of religious lines, so that the minority of today may have a chance of becoming a majority tomorrow, or the day after; and
- (d) must accept the general ideals or principles constituting the foundation of the reconstructed world outlined above, including a common world citizenship, guaranteed fundamental rights of individuals, restricted local sovereignty, and all-round collaboration with the rest of the world on an equal footing.

(14) These rights should include a chapter on special guarantees to Minorities, if any considerable number of people desire it, provided that such rights of Minorities are not incompatible with the basis of the reconstructed world. The obligations corresponding to these rights will be similarly codified or enforced.

The assurance, exercise, or enjoyment of these rights must in no way serve as an obstruction or obstacle to the realisation of the national plan in regard both to production and distribution of the new wealth.

(15) In the development of the country's resources, in the production of new wealth, and in its distribution, those rights and obligations must be fully attended to, so that social justice may be realised in the largest possible degree.

(16) Given our past experience, particular care must be taken in regard to the practice or observation of different religions. Whatever the consequence of religious differences on our present structure, we must see to it that, in the new structure, no room is left for religious intolerance, or divisions running on sectarian lines, which may in any way obstruct the fullest development of available local resources, and the distribution of the resultant wealth in accordance

## INDIA UNDER RECONSTRUCTION

with the ideals of social justice accepted as the basis of the new world.

(17) As a detail of the reconstitution, India, like every other unit, would be expected, entitled, or required to prepare her own plan of all-round development, which will enable the fullest possible, development of her resources and the redistribution of the resultant wealth.

There may have to be more than one such plan, in the event of the country being dismembered. But, if so, these several plans would serve their ends best, if they are integrated *inter se*, and co-related with the corresponding plans of all other units, as far as possible.

(18) A redistribution of the world's population may have to be taken in hand at an early date by agreement. India should be entitled to have her due share in this redistribution, so as to help materially in the standard of living of her people.

(19) India's commerce, with all its accessory services, as of the rest of the world, will be deeply affected by the reconstruction envisaged here. Not only the volume, but also the content and direction, of her foreign trade may be radically altered. The element of private profit must be completely eliminated from the trade of the country, local or foreign.

(20) The instrument of exchange, the media or mode of settlement of international obligations, will, likewise, wear a wholly different aspect from what we have been accustomed to so far. The Indian currency system must be completely freed from any connection with or dependence upon the corresponding British system. India may, however, become a part of the world monetary union by her own free consent.

If the industrial ambitions of India are realised, and the ideal of full local self-government is achieved. India will be able to aid very substantially the aggregate wealth of the world, and so contribute materially to the increase of happiness of every human being on earth.

